

JPRS-UIA-87-012

24 MARCH 1987

USSR Report

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

JPRS-UIA-87-012

24 MARCH 1987

USSR REPORT
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

CONTENTS

WORLDWIDE TOPICS

Reagan-Shamir Talks, Proposals on Mideast (TASS, 19 Feb 87)	1
Soviet Physician on Need for 'New Thinking' in Nuclear Age (M. Vartanyan; PRAVDA, 6 Dec 86)	2
Table of Contents of 'INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS' in 1986 (INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, No 12, Dec 86)	5

EAST-WEST RELATIONS

Importance of Human Rights, Cultural Ties in World Affairs (Yuri Kashlev; INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, No 12, Dec 86)	13
Assessment, Document of Stockholm Conference (INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, No 12, Dec 86)	25
Results Assessed, by Yuri Rakhmaninov	25
Text of Document	28
CSCE Initiatives in Vienna Viewed (Yuri Bandura; MOSCOW NEWS, No 5, 8-15 Feb 87)	29
EEC-Soviet Talks in Brussels on Official Relations (Mikhail Yakovlev; NEW TIMES, No 5, 9 Feb 87)	31

SOCIALIST COMMUNITY AND CEMA AFFAIRS

Results of Coordination of CEMA Economic Plans (Valeri Andreyev, Vladimir Samovol; INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, No 12, Dec 86)	33
--	----

Use of CEMA Experience in Service Sector Examined (Nikita Zhovkver; NEW TIMES, No 7, 23 Feb 87)	41
THIRD WORLD ISSUES	
CEMA Cooperation With Socialist-Oriented States Described (Alexander Aleshkin; CMEA. ECONOMIC COOPERATION, No 3, 1986)	45
Islamic Conference Organization Meeting Assessed (Leonid Medvedko; NEW TIMES, No 6, 16 Feb 87)	50
World Economists' Congress on Problems in Agricultural Sector (O. Bogomolov; PRAVDA, 27 Jan 87)	52
GENERAL ECONOMIC AFFAIRS	
Reply to FRG Criticism of Joint Ventures (Genrikh Bazhenov; NEW TIMES, No 6, 16 Feb 87)	56
Interofis Chief Discusses Purpose, Facilities (Yekaterina Bulychova; MOSCOW NEWS, No 8, 1-8 Mar 87) .	58
Review of V/O Exportles' 60 Years of Operations (SUPPLEMENT TO MOSCOW NEWS, No 5, Feb 87)	60
Review of Book on Legal Aspect of Foreign Economic Relations (Ivan Rozhko; INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, No 11, Nov 86)	62
UNITED STATES AND CANADA	
Reagan Critics Link Irangate, Arms Talks (Melor Sturua; IZVESTIYA, 12 Feb 87)	64
WESTERN EUROPE	
Goals, Problems of Eureka Project Discussed (Valery Slavinsky; NEW TIMES, No 6, 16 Feb 87)	68
CP of Spain Meets With CPSU in Moscow (APN DAILY REVIEW, 24 Feb 87)	72
Briefs Western Catering Firms Contract	75
EASTERN EUROPE	
Czech Approach To Unprofitable Enterprises Discussed (Miklos Ovari; NEW TIMES, No 5, 9 Feb 87)	76

CHINA/FAR EAST/PACIFIC

Japan's Military Budget Decision Viewed
(Leonid Mlechin; NEW TIMES, No 16, 16 Feb 87) 78

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Africa's Problems, OAU's Role in Their Solution Assessed
(Nikolai Svetlanov; INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, No 11, Nov 86) 80

Formation of International 'AFRICA' Movement Reported
(Leonid Zhegalov; NEW TIMES, No 5, 9 Feb 87) 87

CEMA, Mozambique Sign Cooperation Agreement
(CEMA. ECONOMIC COOPERATION, No 3, 1986) 88

/7310

WORLDWIDE TOPICS

REAGAN-SHAMIR TALKS, PROPOSALS ON MIDEAST

LD191613 Moscow TASS in English 1337 GMT 19 Feb 87

[Text] Washington February 19 TASS--President Ronald Reagan and Israeli Prime Minister Yitzha' Shamir, now in the USA on an official visit, had White House talks on Wednesday.

After the meeting Reagan and Shamir made statements to the press stressing special character of American-Israeli relations. President Reagan said there existed strong and extensive ties between the two countries. One indication of this, he said, was the granting to Israel of the official status of an ally of the USA, enjoyed by NATO countries.

This step by the White House gives Israel additional benefits, including the right to purchase American military equipment at lower prices, greater U.S. assistance with building military installations and bases, greater access to the arms market of the United States, and the right for Israel to take part in military research, conducted by the Pentagon, and development of new types of weapons.

As a recipe for Middle East settlement President Reagan suggested again the way of separate deals between Israel and its neighbours, the way which has already led the process of settlement in the region to a blind alley. Shamir, for his part, rejected the idea of calling an international conference on the Middle East with the participation of all the sides concerned. At the same time he reaffirmed Tel Aviv's readiness to join in more actively in the realization of U.S. military preparations. He stressed that Israel was among the first to join the SDI and hoped for broader cooperation under this programme.

Commenting on the strengthening of the American-Israeli alliance, mass media say that the United States is giving Israel more aid than it does to any country of the world—three billion dollars a year.

/8309
CSO: 1812/79

WORLDWIDE TOPICS

SOVIET PHYSICIAN ON NEED FOR 'NEW THINKING' IN NUCLEAR AGE

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Dec 86 p 4

[Article by M. Vartanyan, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences: "To Live in a Civilized Way: Psychology and Imperatives of the Nuclear Age"; the first paragraph is the PRAVDA introduction]

[Text] The future of humanity...under the conditions of the arms race, as well as atomic weapons, there are many skeptics in the world who pose the question of how long this future may last. In answer to them, optimists counterpose the reason of peoples to the adventurism of militaristic forces and their ability to restrain the torch-bearers of war.

The psychology of war propaganda is usually based on the idea of arms superiority over the opponent. In our nuclear age a similar way of thinking, which creates for advocates of the arms race illusory conceptions of their own security, in actuality not only does not create security, but with each new turn brings us closer to war. A question arises: both how to smash in people's consciousness the stereotype of the old thinking and how to turn them toward the new thinking.

Success in the struggle to avert nuclear war will depend greatly on whether people understand that the nuclear epoch cardinally changes the character of international relations.

Intensive psychological reworking of public opinion has been conducted in the Western countries in the course of the last decades. The Soviet Union is made out to be the "evil empire," and the Soviet people are presented as a crowd of people devoid of positive qualities; and furthermore, such statements are made by the leaders of the U.S. However, not all Americans perceive things this way. Thus, the well-known American physician, Professor A. Coulter, writes: "We must stop the 'cold war.' In order to do this we need to 'think the unthinkable' and go beyond the limits of ingrained stereotypes governing our perceptions of one another. Americans must stop viewing the Soviet Union as the 'enemy' and the 'evil empire' intent on conquering the whole world. "The Soviet people," the American scholar continues, "has a rich culture, they have accomplished and endured much, they have historical experience that differs from ours and a geographic situation much like our own. Americans must remember the old saying" 'Don't condemn a man until you have walked a mile in his shoes.'"

"And above all," concludes A. Coulter, "let's discard the fear and hatred drummed into us for 40 years and try to understand purely as people why they think and act the way they do."

This clear and simple conclusion drawn by the American medic and scholar caused him to turn to his Soviet colleagues with the request to help him build "bridges of peace" in order to know and understand better the Soviet people.

A good example of cooperation between Soviet and American doctors is the study of the opinions of Soviet and American children and adolescents regarding nuclear war. As our American colleagues have determined, U.S. young people, much more often than their peers in the Soviet Union assume it is probably impossible to avert the start of nuclear war. On the other hand, Soviet young people think that the consequences of nuclear war will be much more catastrophic for humanity than do Americans of the same age. Research has shown young people in the USSR to be more informed and objective in their assessments of nuclear problems.

In discussing the necessity of forming a new way of thinking, it is necessary to take into consideration that for the majority of our contemporaries, nuclear war is psychologically somewhat abstract. Therefore, one of the tasks in creating a new way of thinking is an objectively informed public opinion, especially of youth, concerning the actual consequences of a possible thermo-nuclear catastrophe.

In recent years much work in this direction has been accomplished by the international organization "International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War" (Co-chairs: E. Chazov, USSR, and B. Laun, USA). Scientific studies made by scholarly medical personnel of various countries have proved convincingly the irrevocable catastrophic nature of the biomedical consequences of nuclear war.

One of the most important tasks facing scholars struggling for peace is the destruction of the "nuclear illusions" created by militaristic propaganda.

The human mind and man's perception of the environment are already oriented in such a way that in order to perceive a new problem profoundly and completely, it must be repeated numerous times. It is precisely for this reason that a whole series of public and scholarly organizations, such as the Soviet Council of Physicians for Prevention of Nuclear War, the Harvard Nuclear Study Group, and World Without War Council (USA), have systematically become involved with various aspects of the creation of a new way of thinking and in particular, with questions of child-rearing in the spirit of peace. These problems will be a subject of discussion at the Seventh International Congress of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, which will take place in Moscow in 1987.

The psychology of the new way of thinking must develop on the basis of creative, productive ideas. The new way of thinking must be creative, not reactive, in nature. By "reactive" is meant that way of thinking which is based on the principle of one side answering (reacting to) the actions of the other. The reactive character of this thinking creates an exclusive

circle in the confrontation of the sides, and is insufficiently productive and offers little prospect for achieving progress in halting the arms race. Counterposed to this is the creative (constructive) way of thinking, based on ideas which are global in scale and positive in nature. A fine example of the creative way of thinking is the Soviet Union's announcement of a moratorium on nuclear explosions.

Our time requires rejection of old, traditional ways of thinking. For many years the means of mass propaganda have created stereotypes in the thinking of the population of the Western countries, built on the counterposition of the images of the American and Soviet peoples: the Americans are peaceful, educated, strong, noble, rich, and honest; the Soviet people are aggressive, illiterate, gloomy, unfriendly, and dishonest. This whole set of unclean labels is used with the aim of creating an atmosphere of alienation in the Americans and the inhabitants of other Western countries in regards to our people.

Just think millions and millions of people in the West have hammered into their heads the idea that the Soviet Union is the enemy, "better dead than Red," and that if you want to live in peace, you must prepare for war. Psychologically such stereotypic thinking induces an atmosphere of fear and distrust in the population, impeding mutual understanding between peoples. The dismantling of such stereotypes is an indispensable condition for the creation of a new way of thinking, which must not be based on artificially inflamed emotions and prejudices.

In the Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 27th Party Congress the necessity of "not closing our eyes to social, political, and ideological contradictions, mastering the art and science of conducting ourselves with restraint and circumspectly in the international arena, and living in a civilized way, that is, under conditions of proper international contact and collaboration" was noted.

It is precisely these requirements that must be the basis of creating a new political thinking of today.

13320/12828
CSO: 1807/93

WORLDWIDE TOPICS

TABLE OF CONTENTS OF 'INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS' IN 1986

Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS in English No 12, Dec 86 pp 144-151

[Text]

No.	Page	
Mikhail Gorbachev Meets Representatives from International Forum of Scientists to Stop Nuclear Tests	9	3
Statement by Mikhail GORBACHEV, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee	3	3
Statement Made by Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on Soviet Television	10	3
 WORLD SOCIALIST SYSTEM		
General Problems		
Andreyev V. International Socialist Emulation	1	152
Andreyev V., Samovol V. The Coordination of Economic Plan of CMEA Countries: Major Results	12	18
Bauman L. CMEA Cooperation Priority Lines. All-Round Automation	11	138
Bogomolov O. USSR in the System of Socialist Economic Integration	7	70
Bolshakov S. Washington's Subversion Against the European Socialist Countries	9	116
Bykov A. Business Ties and Politics (The Experience of East-West Relations)	7	90
Chukanov O. Scientific and Technological Progress in the CMEA Countries	3	20
Dyakin B., Medvedev B. Deepening Economic Integration As the Material Basis for the CMEA Countries' Further Cohesion	2	12
Yegorov A. The Transport Thoroughfares of the Socialist Community	4	142
Kalyuzhny S. Business Ties of the CMEA with Japan	11	58
Kashlev Yu. Humanitarian Aspects of International Cooperation	12	84
Konstantinov Yu. Lack of Prospects for Imperialist Policy of Credit Dis-		
 criminalization Against the CMEA Countries		
Mikhailov Yu. The Main Potential of Peace (The Results of the Meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty Member States)	1	43
Penziy I. Electronics and National Economy	7	141
Penziy I. CMEA Priority: New Materials and Technologies for Their Processing	9	142
Shibayev S. Mutually Beneficial Cooperation on Third-Country Markets	7	148
Shvanev V. Dubna	4	112
 USSI		
Akhlamzyan A. Leninist Principles of the International Policy of the CPSU and the Soviet State	3	11
Alexandrov A. Soviet-Swiss Relations: Past and Prospects	4	90
Alexandrov V. Soviet-Turkish Cooperation	12	33
Andreyev V. The Steps of Five-Year Plans	3	143
Andreyev V. Construction Projects of the Five-Year Plan	7	143
Arismendi R. The Soviet People Sets Itself Historical Goals	6	85
Azov V., Rubinstein G. Growing Trade and Economic Cooperation Between the Soviet Union and Developing Countries	12	26
Bogomolov O. USSR in the System of Socialist Economic Integration	7	70
Denisov Yu. USSR-Sweden: To Promote Goodneighbourliness	1	80
Denisov Yu. USSR-Denmark: Good-neighbourly Relations	8	88
Dügersören M. Union and Friendship with the Homeland of the Great October Socialist Revolution	2	20
Editorial. Geneva: Dialogue for Peace	1	3
Editorial. Momentum Plans of Construction and the Policy of Peace	4	3

Editorial. The 27th Congress of the CPSU and its International Significance	6	3	
Editorial. Soviet Moratorium: Strategy of Peace in Action	11	3	
Florakis H. The International Impact of the 27th Congress Will Be Both Comprehensive and Significant	6	83	
Kapronov I., Dogayev A. The USSR and the Developing Countries (Tangible Results of Economic and Technological Cooperation)	3	28	
Kashian W. People Can See Now More Than Before That Peace and Socialism Come Together	6	89	
Khachaturov K. Soviet-Uruguayan Relations: Yesterday and Today	9	67	
Kiryanov A. The USSR and the PRC: Border Area Trade	10	154	
Koshelev P. Soviet-African Economic and Technical Cooperation in the 1980s	10	46	
Minayev L. The Democratic Nature of Soviet Foreign Policy	10	21	
Nzo A. The USSR Will Continue to Stand Up for the Just Cause of the Peoples	6	93	
Olgin Ye. Soviet-Spanish Cooperation and Detente in Europe	10	84	
Padilla R. The 27th CPSU Congress: An Event of Historic Significance	6	94	
Papaloannou E. The USSR Is in the Vanguard of the Struggle for Peace	6	88	
Petrov V. The Lessons of History (45th Anniversary of the Start of the Great Patriotic War)	6	12	
Sanakoyev Sh., Kapchenko N. A Programme of Struggle for Peace and Social Progress	1	11	
Sanakoyev Sh. The 27th Congress of the CPSU and Issues of War and Peace	5	3	
Sanakoyev Sh. 27th CPSU Congress on Soviet Foreign Policy: Main Directions	10	9	
Shiryayev Yu., Barkovsky A. The International Significance of the 12th Five-Year Plan Period	4	23	
Vanin V. Soviet-Brazilian Relations Keep Developing	3	37	
Vavilov V. The Solid Foundation for Soviet-Indian Relations	9	28	
Vildanov R. A Celebration of Working People Unity and Solidarity	6	23	
Vilner M. Peace Is Necessary for the Implementation of Creative Plans	6	91	
Volodarov P. The Soviet Programme for Nuclear Disarmament	7	62	
Vostrikov Yu. The Socialist Way of Life—Justice and Humanism	6	41	
Vlorov A., Karelov Yu. The Dynamic European Policy of the USSR	6	97	
Yegorov B., Yevgeniev V. USSR and Greece: What Makes for Mutual Understanding and Good-Neighbourly Relations	11	84	
CHINA			
Kiryanov A. The USSR and the PRC: Border Area Trade	10	154	
CUBA			
Nemira L. Cuba: On the Eve of the Third Party Congress	2	144	
Prieto, Pedro Mirt. The First Victorious Battle for Socialism in Latin America	5	77	
CZECHOSLOVAKIA			
Pusenkov N. Czechoslovakia: Stepping Up Economic Growth	7	147	
DMRK			
Trigubenko M. The 1-hour Effort of People's Korea	9	144	
GDR			
Babichenko L. An Unbending Fighter Against Nazism and Reaction (Centenary of the Birth of Ernst Thälmann)	5	81	
Lazarev V. The GDR: New Guidelines for Socialist Economic Development	10	148	
LAOS			
Sergin V. Socialist Transformations in Laos	1	59	
MONGOLIA			
Dügerstren M. Union and Friendship with the Homeland of the Great October Socialist Revolution	2	20	
Polemkins L. The Achievements of People's Mongolia	8	126	
POLAND			
Vasilkov Yu. Between the Bug and the Odra	6	120	
VIETNAM			
Glazunov A. The Socialist Republic of Vietnam: Labour Achievements	9	146	
YUGOSLAVIA			
Glenko Yu. A Glorious Page in Yugoslavia's History (Forty-Five Years Since the Beginning of the National Liberation Struggle)	8	24	
Ostrovskov Yu. Yugoslavia: the Thirteenth LCY Congress	11	140	
Shaslikov Ye. Retribution	10	132	
PROBLEMS OF WAR AND PEACE, INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AND DISARMAMENT			
Apalov G. Peace and Security for Asia and the Pacific	11	21	
Babich Yu. Peaceful Coexistence and Erroneous Arguments of Its Opponents	8	16	
Boglov M. Playing with Fire, or How the Americans Are Urged to Accept the Nuclear Bomb	12	96	

Beletsky V. What Lies Behind the "European Defence Initiative" Project	6	49	Silin E. Ways of Safeguarding European Security	3	89
Borisov K. For Progress at the Vienna Talks	6	110	Semov M. "Star Peace", Not "Star Wars"	3	54
Borisov K. The Concept of Territorial Limitation of Nuclear Arms	9	93	Semov M. SDI—Insane Political Thinking in the Nuclear and Space Era	7	81
Borisov K. Soviet Moratorium and Its Opponents	12	12	Sovetsky A. Complete Elimination of Nuclear Weapons—The Soviet Programme	4	12
Bykov A. New Stage of SDR and East-West Economic Ties	1	89	Sovetsky A. 27th Congress of the CPSU on Imperialism's Aggressive Policy	8	3
Chernyshov M. Star Peace vs. "Star Wars"	9	53	Sukhii G. Curbing the Arms Race As a Crucial Problem of Today	2	3
Dmitriev T. Today's Realities and the "Nuclear Deterrence" Doctrine	10	56	Timoleev T. Public Opinion and World Politics	3	46
Dmitriev V. Struggle for a Nuclear-Free Zone in Northern Europe	7	115	Tolkunov L. Parliaments and the Preservation of Peace	2	28
Editorial. Geneva: Dialogue for Peace	1	3	Tolkunov L. Conception of Security: Two Approaches	9	13
Editorial. Soviet Moratorium: Strategy of Peace in Action	11	3	Tolstov V., Kataudze V. Who Benefits from the Myths of the Soviet Threat	12	39
Filippov P. Chemical Weapons and Ecology	8	41	Tomilin Yu. Nuclear Blasts Must Be Banned	6	107
Grigoryants A. Warning of Nuremberg	1	96	Tomilin Yu. The Programme for Reducing the Armed Forces and Conventional Armaments	9	22
Grigoryants A. Europe—Our Common Home	4	81	Tomilin Yu. Soviet Programme for Fully Eliminating Mass Destruction Weapons	12	72
Gromyko Anat., Lomeiko V. New Ways of Thinking and "New Globalism"	5	15	Victorov V. The Southern Bridgehead of Aggression	8	132
Iorich A., Misharin V. The Effectiveness of the Treaty of the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons	1	124	Vladimirsky P. Principles of a Comprehensive International Security System	11	10
Ivanov M. War Business Advocates and the Economic Realities of Disarmament	11	40	Volodarov V. The Soviet Programme for Nuclear Disarmament	7	62
Kapchenko N. Political Aspects of International Security	9	84	Tergeniev G. Forestalling the Chemical Weapons Race—The Task of the Day	2	72
Kashlev Yu. The Lessons of Bern—Who Is Against Contacts	10	39	Zhukov Yu. The World Situation and Antiwar Movements	4	95
Kazakov V. Regional Conflicts and International Security	2	45	Zhukov Yu. Europe and NATO	10	90
Kondratkov T. Ideological Confrontation Over the Issues of War and Peace	9	34			
Kortunov V. Imperialist Power Politics and the Realities of the Present-Day World	6	31	INTERNATIONAL FOR JMS AND ORGANIZATIONS. INTERNATIONAL LAW		
Kouzar V. Springboard for Aggression	1	157			
Lebedev Yu. Why the USA Has Abandoned SALT-2	11	109	Andreyev O. International Legal Documents	9	156
Losev S. Two Approaches Towards an Information Policy	1	35	Andreyev S. Diplomatic Mission	5	151
Lugin V. A Dangerous Partnership	2	85	Chernyakov Yu. The Development of Diplomatic Services and Today's World	9	106
McBride S. Weapons in Outer Space Must Be Banned	2	85	Andreyev S. Diplomatic Privileges and Immunities	7	151
Petrov B. A Realistic Way Towards Liquidation of Nuclear Weapons	10	32	Dmitriev A. The Soviet-African Symposium	9	159
Peréz de Cröller The Maintenance of Peace Is a Paramount Task	3	120	Govryushkin A. UNIDO—A New Specialised UN Agency	1	159
Petrov V. The Lessons of History	6	12	Gorokhov P. The United Nations and International Security	12	3
Pustogarov V. The Lessons of Nuremberg and their Relevance	8	57	Kartashkin V. Arbitrary Rule of the USA in International Law	3	108
Pyadyshev B. The Military Aspects of International Security	8	79	Klyuchnikov B. Attacks on UNESCO and the UN Under the Guise of "Peaceableness"	2	91
Rumyantsev Ye. Non-Alignment and the Struggle for Peace	5	104	Kolosovsky A. Non-Aligned Countries in the UN	4	124
Sanakoyev Sh. The 27th Congress of the CPSU and Issues of War and Peace	5	3	Makeyev E. Improvement of International Economic Relations: an Imperative of Our Day	5	37
Shchetinin V. Economic Aspects of International Security	10	100			

Markov G. International Monetary Fund: An Instrument of Imperialist Policy	8	105	
Pavlov O. Recognition and Establishment of Diplomatic Relations	2	149	
Pavlov O. Diplomatic Correspondence	8	135	
Pavlov O. The Diplomatic Corps	8	138	
Pavlov O. Consular Activities	11	147	
Petrovsky V. Cooperation, Not Confrontation (The Results of the 40th Session of the UN General Assembly)	3	37	
Rakhmaninov Yu. Results of the Stockholm Conference	12	131	
Repin A. The World Trade Union Congress and Its Significance	12	114	
Roshchin A. The United Nations: Coming Into Being	9	124	
Roshchin A. How the United Nations Got Started	10	121	
Sergiyev A. The Non-Aligned Movement and Today's World	9	60	
Sergiyev A. The Present Stage of the Non-Aligned Movement	12	106	
Serov V. An Organisation of the Environment Protection Activists	4	148	
Simonyan N. The Charter of Freedom and Independence (25 Years of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples)	1	51	
Sorokina O. A Round Table Discussion of Global Problems	8	142	
Svetlanov N. Africa's Problems and the OAU's Role in Their Solution	11	120	
Tanin O. Foreign Policy Organs of States	4	149	
The Key Issues of the Political Debate (From Speeches by Heads of Delegations at the UN General Assembly)	2	100	
Uranov G. A Respectable World Body	11	49	
Vasiliyev R. A Representative Forum of Anti-Imperialist Solidarity	8	140	
Vylegzhannina E. Washington in the Pillory	11	144	
Zakaria, Ibrahim Trade Unions in the Struggle for Peace and Social Progress	6	65	

WORLD CAPITALIST SYSTEM. GENERAL PROBLEMS

Bolshakov V. "Human Rights" in the US Strategy of Social Revenge	1	17	
Bulinov N. New Priorities of the "Old Continent"	10	79	
Bykov A. Business Ties and Politics (The Experience of East-West Relations)	7	90	
Ellimonova T. The EEC—Seeking Ways of Overcoming Contradictions)	9	75	
Gasanov R. Narcotics: A Lucrative Business	9	148	
Golikov A. TNC Crimes in the Developing Countries	1	132	
Gorbunov S. The Growing Instability of the Monetary and Financial System of Capitalism	3	124	
Kalasonov Yu. The Militaristic Policy of the USA As Reflected in Its Budget	1	110	

Knyazyan A. Militarisation and Interimperialist Rivalry	4	47	
Konstantinov Yu. Lack of Prospects for Imperialist Policy of Credit Discrimination Against the CMEA Countries	5	53	
Magarin Yu. Information Imperialism and Its Class Essence	5	70	
Markov G. International Monetary Fund: An Instrument of Imperialist Policy	8	105	
Midtsev V. USA—South Africa: A Sinister Alliance	1	72	
Nikolayev V. "Friends" as Cannon Fodder	1	129	
Pokrovsky A. The Western Economy: Difficulties and Contradictions	8	32	
Rymalov V. The Crisis of the World Capitalist System and the Developing Countries	3	63	
Shapiro A. The Economy of Capitalism at the Present Stage of Its General Crisis	4	37	
Shibayev S. Mutually Beneficial Cooperation on Third-Country Markets	7	148	
Shishikov Yu. Inter-Imperialist Rivalry Escalates	5	28	
Yershov S. The Mounting Contradictions Between Labour and Capital	12	48	

USA

Andreyev E. Washington's Policy in Micronesia—A Creeping Annexation	5	114	
Beglov M., Beglov S. Guardians on the Potomac	7	122	
Bolshakov S. Washington's Subversion Against the European Socialist Countries	9	116	
Bolshakov V. A Doctrine of International Brigandage	11	100	
Denillo E. Political and Ideological Trends in the US Peace Movement	2	51	
Georgiyev V. Washington's Strategy in South and Southwest Asia	12	57	
Gurev V. US Anti-Libyan Acts of Brigandage	6	116	
Kalashnikov V. Obscurantist in the Guise of Historian	4	119	
Karashkin V. Arbitrary Rule of the USA in International Law	3	108	
Konobeev V., Medvedkov S. Militarism and Economic Expansion of the USA	8	96	
Krasnov V. Militaristic Exercises of the Pentagon and NATO	3	146	
Kunsevich A. What Lies Behind the Binary Programme	11	32	
Lazarev A. What Goes on Behind the Facade of Well-Being	4	146	
Lebedev Yu. Why the USA Has Abandoned SALT-2	11	109	
Levchenko Yu. A "Battle for the Minds" of the Younger Generation	5	119	
Lyuty A. Behind Washington's Glamour	2	127	
Menkes Ye. The USA: Elections Without a Choice	10	152	
Musaelyan G. Washington—Tel-Aviv Military Alliance	7	130	
Nikolayev V. US Anti-Arab Policies	5	107	

Ovinnikov R. Doctrine of Neoliberalism and Washington's Imperial Policy	10	111	Yegorov B., Yevgeniyev V. USSR and Greece: What Makes for Mutual Understanding and Good-Neighbourly Relations	11	84
Petrusenko V. The Doctrine of Global Interference and Terrorism	3	121	Zhebit A. Portugal: At a Complex Stage	6	77
Petrusenko V. The CIA and the Shaping of US Foreign Policy	5	95	JAPAN		
Polyakovskiy O. The Heritage Foundation: Think Tank of the US Administration	3	148	Kalyuzhny S. Business Ties of the CMEA with Japan	11	58
Pyadyshcheva Y. Behind the Mask of the Fight Against Terrorism	4	122	Petrov D. Japan and Space Militarisation Plans	6	56
Rogachev V. What Is Behind American Aid	9	150	Solntsev V. The Other Side of the "Japanese Miracle"	8	66
Rymalov V. US Economy in the 1980s: Problems and Trends	9	43	CANADA		
Selunsky M. Verbiage Around Human Rights	3	98	Bagramov L., Popov V. Free Trade in North America and Canada's Sovereignty	3	81
Strok I. Central America: Greater Opposition to Washington	12	65	NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENT, THE PROBLEMS FACING ASIAN, AFRICAN AND LATIN AMERICAN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES. GENERAL PROBLEMS		
Travkin V. USA Escalates Interference in Central America	4	103	Andreyev E. Washington's Policy in Micronesia—A Creeping Annexation	5	114
Ustimenko Yu. The Vandals of American Culture	11	112	Apalik G. Peace and Security for Asia and the Pacific	11	21
Volpansky P. "The Land of Equal Opportunity": Myths and Realities	8	128	Chernyshev N. Alliance of Monopolists and Militarists Against Developing Countries	11	75
Vostrosabina S. Three Aspects of US Economic Problems	5	128	Drach V. The "Brain Drain" from Newly Free States	3	130
Vylegzhannina E. Washington in the Pillory	11	144	Gavrilchev I. The Asian Pacific Region: Confrontation or Cooperation?	7	100
FRANCE					
Vladimirov S. France: On the Eve of Parliamentary Elections	3	150	Ionova A. Islam and the Contemporary World	11	145
FRG					
Kirillov G. Bonn: Peaceable Rhetoric and Militaristic Practices	4	55	Kapranov I., Dogayev A. The USSR and the Developing Countries (Tangible Results of Economic and Technological Cooperation)	3	28
GREAT BRITAIN					
Belyaev M. Great Britain's Military-Industrial Complex	1	154	Konstantinov V. A Middle East Settlement and Its Opponents	1	105
Malveyev V. Britain and World	11	91	Kurochkin O. Micronesia: A Pentagon Probing Ground	1	119
Metress S. Does Great Britain Strive to Establish Peace in Northern Ireland?	5	89	Obminsky E. The Newly Free Countries in the Struggle for Economic Security	11	66
Voskobolnikov D. British Cities in Crisis	8	130	Rymalov V. The Crisis of the World Capitalist System and the Developing Countries	3	63
OTHER COUNTRIES OF WESTERN EUROPE					
Alexandrov A. Soviet-Swiss Relations: Past and Prospects	4	90	Tarabrin Ye. Newly Free Countries and International Relations	4	29
Denisov Yu. USSR-Denmark: Good-neighbourly Relations	8	88	Ryablinin V. India: Defending National Unity	12	119
Dmitriyev V. Struggle for a Nuclear-Free Zone in Northern Europe	7	115	Volkov M. The Imperialist Essence of Collective Neocolonialism	4	64
Karelov Yu. The Smaller Countries of Europe in the Modern World	2	65	ASIA		
Kuzar V. Northern Europe in NATO's Plans	9	153	Andreyev V., Semenov V. Proponents and Opponents of Dialogue in Southeast Asia	2	57
Metress S. Does Great Britain Strive to Establish Peace in Northern Ireland?	5	89	Andreyev Yu. The Philippines on the International Scene	10	72
Olgin Ye. Soviet-Spanish Cooperation and Detente in Europe	10	84	Arunova M. Afghanistan: Truth Against Lie	1	137
Paklin N. The Industrial Heart of Italy	7	135	Kapustin D. South Korea: Mounting Resistance to the Anti-Popular Regime	8	72
Vladimirov V. NATO's West European Bulwark	2	147			

Leonidov M. "New" Aspects of the USA's Policy Towards India	8	112	America's Turbulent Years, (Documentary Essays on US Domestic Realignments and Foreign Policy in the 1970s and 1990s)	1	144
Mikhlin V. Pakistan—Toeing the Washington Line	2	86	Borisov Yu. The French President on the Foreign Policy of His Country François Mitterrand, <i>Réflexions sur la politique extérieure de la France. Introduction à vingt-cinq discours, 1981-1985</i> , (Reflections on the Foreign Policy of France. Introduction to Twenty Five Speeches, 1981-1985)	11	128
Musaclyan G. Washington—Tel-Aviv Military Alliance	7	130	Chernakov A. Annotation (T. V. Tabolina, Ethnic Problems In Contemporary American Science)	12	129
Petrov M. The USSR for Peace and Security in Asia	5	61	Chugrov S. An Argument in Favour of Detente (Raymond L. Garthoff, Detente and Confrontation. American-Soviet Relations from Nixon to Reagan)	8	121
Semyonov V. Revolutionary Afghanistan: Eight Years Later	5	46	Denisov V. Realities of the American Way of Life (E. P. Sevastianov, N. E. Korsakova, The Last Boundary)	2	137
Semyonov V. The Creeping Aggression Against Afghanistan	10	64	Dneprovsky Ye. Genius of the Greatest Revolution of All (M. I. Trush, We Are Optimists, Lenin's Meetings with Foreign Politicians, Diplomats, Journalists, and Businessmen)	5	140
Vavilov V. The Solid Foundation for Soviet-Indian Relations	9	28	Dubinin Yu. A Country in Perspective (B. T. Koloskov, Malaysia Yesterday and Today: A Study in the History of Developing Countries)	2	140
Viktorov V. Whence the Threat to the Persian Gulf?	2	93	Faizov I. An Important Sphere of Diplomacy (I. A. Ornatsky, Economic Diplomacy)	9	136
AFRICA					
Dudarev K. Algeria Adjusts Its Course	5	132	Galanin Yu. Building Developed Socialism (The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic)	1	141
Fyodorov Yu. Côte d'Ivoire	9	151	Georgiev O. The Urgent Problems of the National Liberation Movement (R. Ulyanovsky, The Triumphs and the Troubles of the National Liberation Struggle)	5	142
Gavrilov Yu. The Anti-Apartheid Struggle Flares Up!	5	111	Glushkov V. A Stake on the Arms Race (A. I. Shein, The Military-Industrial Complex of Great Britain)	5	145
Goncharov V. Economic Problems of African Countries	8	49	Gorelik Ya. A Significant Page in the History of the Second World War (M. I. Semiryaga, The Struggle of the Peoples of Central and Southeast Europe Against Nazi Oppression)	4	129
Grigoryants A. Benin	11	142	Gurev V. Realities of the Persian Gulf (V. V. Mashin, A. I. Yakovlev, The Persian Gulf and the Plans and Policy of the West)	8	118
Gromyko A. India's Noble Daughter	2	41	Iskenderov S. New Books on Cuba (V. V. Vladimirov, Cuba's Role in Inter-American Relations)	1	140
Gurev V. US Anti-Libyan Acts of Brigandage	6	116	Iskenderov S. Diplomacy During the Second World War (F. D. Volkov, Behind the Scenes of the Second World War)	6	131
Koshelev P. Soviet-African Economic and Technical Cooperation in the 1980s	10	46	Kapitsa M. An Influential Force of Today (The Non-Aligned Movement, Editor-in-Chief I. I. Kovalevko)	2	133
Kravitsova T. Zimbabwe	10	149	Kharukov Ye. Economic Problems of the Oriental Countries (V. Yu. Kukushkin, Oil and Development: Libya, Algeria; M. S. Modelevsky, R. N. Andreasyan, V. I. Iskol'dsky, L. I. Luzhnikova, Fuel and		
Nikolayev V. US Anti-Arab Policies	5	107			
Palin A. The USSR-Zimbabwe: A New Stage of Relations	3	117			
Pokrovsky A. The Apartheid Regime and Its Imperialist Patrons	9	101			
Svetlanov N. Africa's Problems and the OAU's Role in Their Solution	11	120			
Umov A. Washington and Pretoria: A Plot Against Angola	4	72			
Vasilkov V. Africa: US Imperial Policy in Action	6	69			
Vladimirsky A., Lavrentyev V. Libya	4	144			
Yakovlev V. USSR-Madagascar Relations Are Making Headway	12	80			
Yegoshkin A., Tamarin M. Saudi Arabia	1	155			
LATIN AMERICA					
Khachaturov K. US Ideological Aggression in Latin America	1	64			
Khachaturov K. Soviet-Uruguayan Relations: Yesterday and Today	7	67			
Mayorov M. The Amazon Basin	8	133			
Montedonico, Ruben Who Is Disrupting the Settlement of the Central American Conflict?	10	140			
Reyes S. Imperialism Bears Responsibility for the Crisis in Latin America	2	80			
Travkin V. USA Exercises Influence in Central America	4	103			
Yanin V. Soviet-Brazilian Relations Keep Developing	3	37			
Yakovlev P. The Imperialist Policy of Militarising Latin America	7	108			
Zaitsev H. Latin America in the Grip of the Foreign Debt	3	73			
BOOK REVIEWS					
Borisov A. The Origins of Aggressive American Policy, Igor Pavlov,					

Energy Problems of Foreign Asia and North Africa]	4 140	Presnyakov V. Abandoning Trile Clches (M. Lavigne, Economic International des pays socialistes)	8 119
Khromov V. Commitment to Internationalist Duty (O. Borisov, The Soviet Union and the Revolutionary Stronghold In Manchuria (1945-1949)	2 139	Pyadyshov B. Socialism and the Struggle of Ideas (Sloyan Mikhailov, Sociological Problems of Developed Socialism)	9 134
Kireyev A. Pentagon's "Space Shield" (Carlos de Sa Rego, Fabrizio Tonello, La guerre des étoiles)	12 127	Rozhko I. The Legal Aspect of the Foreign Economic Relations of the Soviet Union (N. Mironov, Vneshniye svyazi ministerstv, obyedineniy i predpriyatiy. Pravovye voprosy [The Foreign Relations of Ministries, Associations and Enterprises. Legal issues]	11 134
Kuleshov S., Onishchenko P. The National Question in the Ideological Struggle (E. A. Bagramov, I. A. Geyevsky, The National Question: Two Systems—Two Approaches; I. A. Geyevsky, S. A. Chervonnaya, The National Question in the Socio-Political Life of the USA]	5 147	Safonov A. Annotation (A. V. Baryshev, El Salvador: "Two Wars")	9 140
Klyuchnikov B. European Economic Cooperation As a Factor of Defense (East-West Trade and Finance in the World Economy. A New Look for the 1980s, Ed. by Ch. Saunders)	3 139	Saprykova T. The Key Factor in Nicaragua's Economic Development (Jaime Wheelock Román, Entre la crisis y la agresión. La Reforma Agraria Sandinista)	4 130
Krasnov I. Soviet Foreign Policy Documents [For Peace and Security of Nations. Foreign Policy Documents of the USSR, 1968]	3 135	Sevostyanov P. A Book on Soviet Diplomatic Protocol (D. S. Nikiforov, A. F. Borunkov, Diplomatic Protocol in the USSR: Principles, Norms, Rules)	6 133
Kulkov I. What Is Behind the "Grand Strategy" of the Atlantic Alliance (H. Kissinger, H. Schmidt, J. Schlesinger, J. Francois-Poncel, E. Davignon, Grand Strategy for the Western Alliance]	1 147	Shiryayev Yu. International Positions of the Socialist Community	10 146
Kulkov I. US Nuclear Globalism: A Threat to Peace (W. M. Arkin, K. W. Fieldhouse, Nuclear Battlefields. Global Links in the Arms Race]	6 134	Shikolenko Yu. The Nuclear Deadlock: Looking for a Way Out (Dietrich Fischer, Preventing War In the Nuclear Age)	2 142
Kulkov I. The Hows and Whys of US Political Decision-Making (Roger Hilsman, The Politics of Governing America]	9 137	Shmygov G. America in the 1980s: Manipulation of Mass Consciousness (N. P. Popov, Amerika 80kh. Obschestvennoye mnenie i sozialnye problemy [America in the 1980s. Public Opinion and Social Problems], N. P. Popov, Industria obrazov. Ideologicheskie funktsii sredstv massovoi informatsii v SShA [The Image Industry. Ideological Functions of the Media in the United States])	11 131
Larionov I. A Major Factor of World Politics [The Non-Aligned Movement in the Modern World]	4 137	Shvedov A. The USA vs. the Developing World (R. I. Zimenkov, US Neocolonialism In Our Day [Economic Aspects])	6 130
Makarova N. An Instructive Excursion Into History (G. Gorodetsky, Stafford Cripps' Mission to Moscow, 1940-1942)	5 149	Sillanin A. A Bulwark of Peace and Socialism in Southeast Asia (M. P. Isaev, The Modern Revolutionary Process In Indochina)	8 116
Nezhinsky L. The Leading Force of World Development	10 144	Slavin V. Outlines of Finland's Foreign Policy (Yu. Koinissarov, The Paasikivi-Kekkonen Line: Past, Present and Future)	3 140
Pankova N. The Mercenary Recommendations of a TNC Proponent (T. A. Poynter, Multinational Enterprises and Government Intervention)	8 123	Spasov P. Realities Underrated (S. Brown, The Faces of Power. Constancy and Change in United States Foreign Policy from Truman to Reagan)	1 150
Lesov Yu. A Diplomatic History of the Second World War (V. L. Israelyan, Diplomacy In the War Years [1941-1945])	2 135	Strok I. The Contadora Is Looking for a Political Settlement (Apollinar Diaz-Callejas, Contadora: desafío al Imperio)	9 139
Lazarev M. Washington's Illegal Imperial Ambitions (M. M. Avakov, Y. M. Melnikov, Y. M. Rybakov et. all., US Flouting of International Law]	1 149	Sturua G. US Military's Aggressive Plans (Daniel Ford, The Button. The Pentagon's Strategic Command and Control System)	4 133
Petrov F. The Ugly Face of Militarism (Y. Nalin, Made In NATO; V. N. Saprykov, Militarism: Political Manifestations and Socio-Economic Consequences]	5 144	Toporin B. Democracy Hollow and Real (E. L. Kuzmin, The Problems of Democracy and the Ideological Battle in the World Arena)	4 135
Pladyshova Y. Weapons Will Not Kill Hope (F. Dyson, Weapons and Hope)	1 145	Trutovsky B. The Benefactors of the	

Antipopular Regime (George Black, Garrison Guatemala)	4 138
Tsedilin L. The GDR in the Fraternal Socialist Community (Die DDR in der Welt des Socialismus [The GDR in the Socialist World], ed. by Dr. Siegmar Quilitsch)	11 126
Turanov A. The Gallery of Antiheroes (Alan Guérin, Jaques Varin, CIA People)	11 136
Vasilyev A. Annotation (A. S. Dzatsokhov, Unity and Cooperation of the Anti-Imperialist National Liberation Forces)	8 125
Vasilyev Ye. A Key Confidence Builder (M. Ye. Nemolyaeva and L. F. Khodorkov, Mezhdunarodnyi Turism: Vchera, Segodnya, Zavtra. [International Tourism; Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow])	11 133
Vidyaeva L. A Key Aspect of Nuclear Problems in the Present-Day World (V. G. Trukhanovsky, The British Nuclear Weapons. History and Politics)	3 137
Yershov Yu. Brighter Prospects on the Horizon (L. N. Tolkunov, Europe and Disarmament)	12 125
Yurin K. The Arms Race Threatens the Environment (A. M. Vavilov, Ecological Consequences of the Arms Race)	1 143
Zagorsky A. A Timely Warning (Die Konventionelle Aufrüstung für die 90er Jahre)	4 132

SCIENTIFIC EVENTS

Dmitriev A. International Congress on Ethiopian Studies	11 150
The Soviet Strategy of Peace and Social Progress (Exchange of Opinion)	7 3

DOCUMENTS

Document of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe Convened in Accordance with the Relevant Provisions of the Concluding Document of the Madrid Meeting of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe	12 134
Report of the Meeting of Experts on Human Contacts Representing the Participating States of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, Foreseen by the Concluding Document of the Madrid Meeting	10 156
Resolutions of the 40th Session of the UN General Assembly	6 136
Statute on the export of chemicals which have a peaceful purpose, but can be used to produce chemical weapons	4 151

COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Znaniye", 1986

English Translation COPYRIGHT: Progress Publishers 1986

IMPORTANCE OF HUMAN RIGHTS, CULTURAL TIES IN WORLD AFFAIRS

Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS in English No 12, Dec 86 pp 84-95

[Article by Professor Yuri Kashlev, D. Sc. (Hist.)]

[Text]

It was held for ages that world politics rest on three pillars reflecting three directions: military, political and economic. The 27th CPSU Congress expanded this traditional notion by placing humanitarian cooperation in the same category of the indispensable components of international security. This is not simply a mechanical increase in the number of pillars of support with the intent of making the system of interstate relations stronger but a recognition of the objective reality that today humanitarian ties between nations in the broad meaning of this word have acquired such importance and scope that a search for ways of improving the international situation is unthinkable without them.

By itself the idea to create an all-embracing system of international security is directed at the solution of the most humane of all present-day tasks--to avert war, save mankind and ensure man's right to live in conditions of peace and freedom. The entire foreign policy activity of the CPSU and the Soviet state, the peace initiatives of the USSR during the past years are subordinated to this loftiest of aims. The USSR programme of ridding the earth of nuclear weapons by the year 2000, the unilateral commitment not to be the first to use nuclear arms as well as the unilateral Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions and its prolongation till January 1, 1987 are imbued with lofty humanism and concern for the fate of human civilisation.

Likewise, the USSR's stand in the economic sphere, directed at solving such burning problems as hunger, poverty, diseases, the general backwardness of tens of young emergent states, saving them from imperialist plunder and the mounting foreign debt, accords with the fundamental interests of the majority of states and nations. The fulfilment of the known Soviet proposal to switch a part of the money saved as a result of disarmament to finance social and economic development and also the implementation in practice of the Soviet concept of an all-embracing system of international security in the economic field would greatly contribute to improving the living conditions virtually of billions of people.

In recent years the Soviet Union made a number of proposals directed at utilising scientific and technological progress in solving mankind's so-called global problems. As an example one can recall the proposal made at the United Nations to develop large-scale cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space, this opening truly boundless prospects.

In other words, whatever sphere of international relations we take - military-political, socio-economic or scientific-technical - the USSR's principled proposals and concrete actions are invariably oriented at creating more favourable conditions for mankind's existence and peaceful development.

The 27th CPSU Congress intensified this humanistic thrust of Soviet foreign policy by raising even more resolutely and in a still more principled manner the burning questions of mankind's life or death, by making new proposals to develop international cooperation, including directly in what is called the humanitarian sphere. And this was done not out of any desire to adjust oneself to the present-day international situation. The new approach organically stems from the beneficial processes developing in the Soviet society after the April 1985 Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee, the growing democratisation, the expansion of the arsenal of the socio-political and individual rights and freedoms of the Soviet citizens, the growing attention to the human factor at the present stage of communist construction.

As the legitimate heir to, and the continuer of, progressive, democratic and humanistic traditions and ideals socialism has every reason to appear in the international arena as the initiator of the solution of global socio-humanitarian problems and of international cooperation in this field. Here we recognise both the independent importance of this cooperation and its impact on the military-political processes taking place in the world arena, and the nature of interstate relations as a whole. The development of a truly civilised, correct international intercourse, the level of trust (or mistrust) between states directly depend on the state of affairs in the humanitarian field and the solution of the diverse problems that have accumulated so far and are cropping up. If there are no attempts artificially to complicate the situation in the humanitarian field, if it is approached from constructive and not confrontational positions, if it is freed of the inertia of the cold war, idle speculations and attempts to interfere in the affairs of others, then this sphere could productively promote the revival and deepening of detente, become one of the mainstays of stable peace and international security.

The programme of international cooperation in the *humanitarian field* set forth by the 27th CPSU Congress provides for:

- cooperation in the dissemination of the ideas of peace, disarmament, and international security; greater flow of general objective information and broader contact between peoples for the purpose of learning about one another; reinforcement of the spirit of mutual understanding and concord in relations between them;
- extirpation of genocide, apartheid, advocacy of fascism and every other form of racial, national or religious exclusiveness, and also of discrimination against people on this basis;
- extension—while respecting the laws of each country—of international cooperation in the implementation of the political, social and personal rights of people;
- decision in a humane and positive spirit of questions related to the reuniting of families, marriage, and the promotion of contacts between people and between organisations;
- strengthening of and quest for new forms of cooperation in culture, art, science, education and medicine!

Suffice it to examine each component of the programme and their combination to see once again how substantiated and broad is the scale of the problems raised by the Soviet Union which are related to the

¹ *Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 27th Party Congress*, Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, Moscow, 1986, p. 95.

struggle for cooperation in humanitarian field and which are expanding goodneighbourly relations between nations.

It is not by chance that the problem of *providing the broad masses with more objective information and of cooperation in the dissemination of the ideas of peace, disarmament and international security* is given pride of place in the Programme.

Our time is called the epoch of the "information explosion". Suffice it to recall that every day 600 million TV sets and 1,400 million radio sets are switched on throughout the world, that vendors get 8,200 daily newspapers with a total single printing of more than 500 million copies, and that every day 2,000 titles of books and booklets are published in the world. Through all these channels people get a huge volume of information not only about their own countries but also about other countries and peoples and international events. And it is primarily on the basis of this information that the broad masses judge about world politics. As Bertold Brecht had once joked, today even the Almighty reads newspapers to find his bearings in the world affairs.

At the same time more and more states resort in one way or another and in varying degrees of intensity to the conduct of a systematic foreign policy propaganda viewing it as an important addition to diplomatic activity. At present, some 80 countries have radio broadcasting services intended specifically for foreign listeners. The dissemination of information on the international level is the job of a growing number of national news agencies (they exist in more than a hundred countries). Publications intended specially for foreign readers are printed in many million copies.

On the whole, the modern mass media have turned into the most powerful instrument of exerting ideological and political influence on the people throughout the world. More than that, its simultaneous impact on people has no precedent in history. Specialists know exactly how many casualties will be caused by an explosion of one nuclear bomb but who can count the number of the victims of just one harmful radio or television programme carried by all the existing channels today? It can be said with certainty that we are speaking in this case of millions upon millions of listeners and viewers.

Just as in any other field of international relations, in the field of information there exist principles and standards approved by the world community and by which states must abide. They are recorded in such fundamental documents as the United Nations Charter, the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (in what concerns the participating states of that conference), relevant conventions and declarations proclaiming the strengthening of peace and mutual understanding as the principal aim of the international exchange of information and censuring the propaganda of militarism, racism and interference in the internal affairs of others. For many years already the Soviet Union has been consistently pressing for the strengthening of this basis of international law for information exchanges and the attainment of the maximum effectiveness of the documents that are adopted.

It was already at the first sessions of the United Nations General Assembly that the USSR made concrete proposals that the propaganda of war and hostility between nations be banned and that the mass media serve aims of peace and international understanding. Already in 1947 the first resolution on this question submitted by the Soviet Union was approved by the United Nations. In 1978, on the USSR's initiative UNESCO adopted a Declaration on Fundamental Principles Concerning the Contribution of the Mass Media to Strengthening Peace and Interna-

tional Understanding, to the Promotion of Human Rights and to Countering Racism, Apartheid, and Incitement to War. The United Nations considered and then adopted a draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union on the principles governing the use by states of artificial satellites of the Earth for direct telecasting and providing for the use of space communications technology in the lofty aims of strengthening peace and friendship among peoples.

Provisions condemning militaristic propaganda are contained in a number of documents adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in recent years on the initiative of the USSR and other socialist countries. One of them qualifies as a crime the dissemination and propaganda of political and military doctrines and concepts designed to substantiate the "lawfulness" of being the first to use nuclear weapons and the "permissibility" of unleashing nuclear war in general. The fact that the overwhelming majority of the UN member countries (with the exception of the United States and its closest allies) voted for this document patently shows that they are greatly concerned by the military hysteria and military psychosis that are being fueled in the West and which have already begun exerting a noticeable negative impact on the entire complex of international relations. Other resolutions adopted at the recent sessions of the UN General Assembly condemn the policy of state terrorism and, as its component part, attempts to undermine the existing systems in other countries and acts of subversion, including by means of propaganda, as well as the dissemination of ideas based on racial superiority and hatred, including the fascist ideology and the propaganda of war.

The Soviet state has never set before its information services, including in the international arena, any tasks but those stemming from its peaceloving foreign policy. It is against the very nature of the Soviet press, radio and television to try to complicate the international situation, fan up tension, spread concoctions about the life of other nations or interfere in their internal affairs. There are simply no forces in the Soviet society that would be interested in this. The same policy is pursued by the other socialist countries. At one of the latest meetings of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation (Prague, 1983) the leaders of socialist countries called for an end to the use of such powerful means of influencing the minds of people as television, radio broadcasting and the press for spreading mistrust and animosity among peoples and to place the mass media at the service of peace and mutual understanding.

Unfortunately, however, these calls by socialist countries are not supported by the West. More than that, the scale of imperialism's "psychological warfare" against the socialist and many developing countries is expanding in recent years, in fact the belligerence and subversive nature of the West's entire propaganda are growing.

Some people may pose the question: is it realistic in these conditions to speak of international cooperation in providing the masses of people with more information, in spreading the ideals of peace and mutual understanding? Is it at all possible for the states to reach any agreement in this sphere which is the arena of fierce ideological struggle?

No denying it, it is a formidable task to achieve international interaction in this field. However, as has been stated above, relevant international accords do exist. So the task is to keep to their provisions in practice, to ensure the dissemination of objective information in the interests of peace and understanding between peoples. And first of all the problem is that the propaganda services of the imperialist countries and the monopoly media should stop abusing the press, radio and television for the purposes hostile to peace.

Besides, the latest achievements of science and technology create

tremendous opportunities for international cooperation in the field of information. Today it is possible to transmit to any part of the world the necessary volume of information by way of television, radio broadcasting, teletype, etc. Just imagine what new prospects are being opened by this for educating the masses in the spirit of peace, for exchanging cultural values, scientific knowledge, for stamping out illiteracy and diseases in the developing regions! Political will alone is needed for international cooperation in this field to develop on a non-confrontational, constructive basis. Even in conditions of the present tension in the Soviet-American relations it has been possible to arrange lately some fifteen telebridges which were seen by millions of people in both countries with a feeling of personal involvement. And who will venture to contend that these telebridges have not served understanding between the two nations?

Lastly, one should take into account the growing understanding by the broad masses of the fact that the struggle against the pollution of the world information environment is increasingly becoming a global task. This struggle is being joined by mighty democratic forces, by organisations of journalists. These problems are being discussed ever more frequently at meetings of scientists, young people and women.

The struggle to use the mass media in the interests of social and cultural progress was given a new impulse by the vigorous participation in it of dozens of young emergent states which are sharply raising the issue of putting an end to "information imperialism" or, as it is also called, "spiritual neocolonialism", and demanding the establishment of a new international information order.

In other words, the struggle for the growing potential of the modern mass media to worthily serve mankind is mounting simultaneously and along various directions. This is profoundly consonant with the task set forth by the 27th CPSU Congress in the sphere of information as an integral part of cooperation in the humanitarian field.

Exercise of human rights as a substantial factor of peace is undoubtedly an important component part of promoting such cooperation. But this requires, firstly, ridding this sphere of hypocrisy and speculations and, secondly, finding possibilities for the constructive interaction of all states and points of contiguity of their positions and interests.

However, the paradox of the present situation is that exactly those who shamelessly violate the rights and freedoms of their own citizens and of whole foreign nations declare themselves to be the principal "champions" of human rights. The very fact that at present there are millions of jobless in the United States, that more than 35 million people there live below the poverty line, that more than two million are homeless and 13 million Americans annually become victims of crimes testifies to the violation of rudimentary human rights in that country. According to American sources US government agencies keep an average of 15 files on every single citizen of that country. The harassing of fighters for civil and political rights is intensifying there, racism flourishes and political assassinations have become quite common. The rights of the citizens are violated on a mass scale in other capitalist countries as well. There are several million unemployed in Britain. The British authorities are engaged in terror in Ulster where several thousand people have already been killed. In West Germany there are millions of jobless as well, while over 6,000 citizens have fallen victim to the "ban on profession" that is applied to the members of progressive parties and movements. The list of such examples could be continued.

Furthermore, how can a state whose leadership is openly preparing for a world thermonuclear war that might claim hundreds of millions of lives

call itself an "outpost of human rights"? For the right to life is the paramount human right. It is not by chance that the enumeration of rights in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights begins with it. However, it is this fundamental right that is being undermined by Washington's militaristic course. It is evidently here that one should look for the reason why at all international forums at which human rights are discussed the United States invariably approaches this problem from fiercely confrontational positions.

It was already at the first follow-up meeting in Belgrade (1977-1978) of the representatives of the 35 states which had taken part in the European Conference in Helsinki that the American delegation obstructed constructive work by its provocative attacks against the socialist countries on the human rights issue. At the Madrid meeting in 1980-1983 the Americans once again blocked its work by presenting unacceptable "demands" to other countries on the same issues. At all recent sessions of the UN General Assembly the American representatives have opposed virtually all draft resolutions on human rights that were submitted to a vote and had the approval of the overwhelming majority of states. In the UN Security Council US representatives have repeatedly vetoed resolutions condemning gross, mass-scale violations of human rights by such countries as Israel and South Africa. It is hardly possible to find even a single important resolution of the UN General Assembly dealing with the struggle against racism, colonialism and apartheid that the United States had not voted against. In 1983, the United States even refused to take part in the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination that was held in Geneva on decision of the UN General Assembly and was attended by representatives of about 130 countries.

In the UN Human Rights Commission the USA invariably defends the rulers of Chile, El Salvador, South Africa, Israel, South Korea and its other "allies" while using every opportunity to provoke a discussion of the internal affairs of the socialist countries. Thus, repeated attempts were made lately at the Commission sessions to railroad resolutions directed against Poland and opposed by the majority of other countries.

Lengthy reports crammed with a maze of flagrant fabrications about "human rights violations" in the socialist countries are regularly published in Washington. After the Helsinki Conference US Congress set up a commission on security and cooperation in Europe, and it is still functioning although its work has nothing to do either with security or cooperation. Its sole function is to collect data on "human rights violations" first of all in the socialist countries, hear "testimony" by "dissidents", etc. In the US State Department such activities are supervised by an Under-Secretary of State. This post was specially created after the Helsinki Conference as well.

Various international conferences, symposiums, etc. on problems of "human rights" and democracy are now being frequently held in Washington through the efforts of the State Department and the USIA (and, naturally, also the CIA which is very active in this field). A whole series of such functions were held in Washington with the participation of "dissidents" from various countries. This subject matter is very much felt also in Washington's Program of Democracy and Public Diplomacy which actually serves as an organisational basis for the "anticommunist crusade".

In contrast to this the Soviet Union has always come out for strengthening the international legislation that serves as a basis for protecting the rights of peoples and citizens (although quite naturally priority here belongs to national legislation). The USSR was the initiator of, and a party to, key international agreements on human rights and is consistently implementing their provisions. It can be recalled that it was the

USSR that vigorously came out for the UN Charter to reflect the basic principles in the field of safeguarding human rights. However, the right to work and education were deleted from the document on the insistence of the United States, Britain and several other Western countries. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) and the International Covenants on Human Rights (1966) were drawn up and adopted with the USSR's active participation.

However, to this day the leading Western countries have not yet ratified the principal international documents concerning human rights. The United States, for instance, has failed to ratify 30 of the 40 presently existing international treaties and conventions in this field. It is not a party to the International Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (1948), the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (1966), has not ratified the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1966), the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966), the International Convention on the Non-Applicability of the Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes Against Humanity (1968), the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid (1973), and a number of other similar international agreements.

Is this not an objective indicator of America's real attitude to human rights and does this not tear off its mask of a "defender of human rights"?

And, of course, one cannot but mention such a flagrant violation of the rights of whole nations as Washington's policy of "state terrorism". Undeclared wars against Afghanistan and Nicaragua, the occupation of Grenada, attacks on Lebanon and Libya - these are but some of the acts of Washington's undisguised state terrorism. And how many more countries became the targets of more or less covert terrorist actions by the American authorities? Not so long ago a presidential directive was signed providing for "preventive strikes" by the United States at the so-called "potential seats of terrorism". In other words, this directive proclaims Washington's right to use armed force against the countries and national liberation movements it dislikes. It was in fulfilment of exactly this directive that peaceful Libyan cities were bombed in 1986.

Such are the practical deeds of the "champions of rights" from Washington who are trying to switch the attention of the world public, including the American people, from their own crimes to the mythical "human rights violations" in the Soviet Union, other socialist countries and in many developing countries.

For the imperialist reaction the unceasing slander campaigns based on the total ignorance of the rank-and-file Americans about the observance of human rights in the socialist countries have become one of the most important instruments for whipping up international tension and undermining understanding and trust among peoples. It follows from this that the cessation of such smear campaigns, as well as of attempts to undermine the existing system in other countries under the cover of the hypocritical slogan of "defence of human rights", should become the first condition of introducing a new, constructive, non-confrontational approach to the matters of humanitarian cooperation in the practice of international relations.

The other condition is the definition of the legal and contractual basis to serve as a foundation for international cooperation in the field of human rights. But does such a basis exist considering that countries with different social systems have different criteria of human values and different concepts of democracy in general? In principle such a basis exists. First of all it is the system of international instruments dealing with hu-

man rights that have been elaborated and approved by the international community. The task now, on one hand, is to make these documents universal so that all or the maximum possible number of states could accede to them and, on the other, to ensure that they are observed in practice and do not remain just a dead letter.

Along with the documents of a universal nature there also exist regional agreements providing for cooperation of states in exercising and protecting human rights, for instance, regional conventions. As to the countries of Europe and North America, they proclaimed the principle of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms in the section of the Final Act dealing with their mutual relations. It says that the participating states recognise the universal significance of human rights and fundamental freedoms respect for which is an essential factor for peace, justice and well-being necessary to ensure the development of friendly relations and cooperation among themselves and among all states, that they will constantly respect these rights and freedoms in their mutual relations and will endeavour jointly and separately to promote universal and effective respect for them. It is emphasised in Article VII of the Final Act that the participating states will fulfil their obligations as set forth in the international declarations and agreements in this field.

In principle, there also exists a consensus on the international level concerning the top priority tasks in the field of human rights at which the efforts of the world community should be directed. These include the struggle against flagrant and large-scale violations of these rights expressing themselves in the policy of neo colonialism, racism and apartheid, in mass murders and persecution of people in the countries with dictatorial regimes. Proceeding from the substance of the issue it should be included here also the struggle against hunger, poverty, illiteracy and homelessness because in each case there are millions of people denied the most elementary and vital rights.

The world community does have the necessary mechanism for developing cooperation in the social and humanitarian fields. It is first of all the United Nations and its agencies starting with the Economic and Social Council and more than a dozen standing committees and commissions. Of late each UN General Assembly session adopts about 70 resolutions on social and humanitarian issues and questions of the rights of nations and individuals, including the right of nations to live in peace, their right to development, observance of human rights in conditions of scientific and technological progress, protection of the rights of invalids and the aged, struggle against crime, terrorism, drugabuse, etc. A sharp ideological and political struggle usually erupts over the most fundamental of these documents with the United States and its closest allies, and sometimes the United States alone, voting against the overwhelming majority of the UN members. Yet a consensus is reached on many issues and resolutions are adopted by unanimous vote or are acclaimed. This means that a basis for developing international cooperation in these matters does exist.

The issue of contacts between people is closely connected with this range of problems. Hundreds of millions of people now take part in such contacts, in reciprocal trips. In the process, rather complex problems still remain or new ones arise in relations between countries with different social systems. Most often they are connected with the reunification of families which are scattered by wars or due to some other circumstances, marriages of people with different citizenship, trips on private business, etc. There is a lot of such problems especially in relations between the participating countries of the European Conference, i. e., those countries which were the most active participants in the Second World War.

The USSR's intent to continue to solve these problems in a positive

and humane spirit was declared at the 27th CPSU Congress. A wide spectrum of measures of a legislative or administrative nature were taken in the Soviet Union in recent years in order to promote the development of international contacts by Soviet citizens, institutions and organisations. They all accord with the spirit and letter of the Helsinki Final Act and the USSR's obligations under other international agreements.

Already after the 27th CPSU Congress the Soviet Union displayed an open and constructive approach to the problem of contacts, including at the European Conference on this matter in Bern that was convened in accordance with the mandate of the Madrid meeting. It is not the USSR's fault that the Bern conference ended without signing that document: it was opposed by Washington which is so profuse in talking about the importance of contacts but in actual fact undermines their very basis. Nevertheless, during his meeting with French President François Mitterrand in the Kremlin in the summer of 1986 Mikhail Gorbachev stated the USSR's readiness to adhere in practice to the Bern document in its bilateral relations with those states that might wish to reach agreement with it on that matter. Incidentally the Bern document was published in the Soviet Union and was not published in other countries. The USSR has already begun to unilaterally implement the proposals it submitted in Bern. For instance, much is being done in the USSR to improve procedures and practice to simplify contacts between people. This is added evidence that the Soviet Union not only proposes the improvement of relations in the humanitarian field as one of the vital elements of international security but also vigorously facilitates progress in this important sphere of international life.

In general, the new way of thinking in the nuclear age, awareness of the interconnection of various components of international life makes one take a fresh view of what is happening in the world arena in the field of human rights and contacts between people and in the broader aspect in the socio-humanitarian sphere as a whole. The time has come to purge this sphere of the sediments created by the "cold war", ideological prejudice and a purely confrontational approach, to find effective, attainable forms, criteria and the framework of international cooperation, to concentrate efforts where the interests of states coincide, to ensure observance of generally recognised standards of international law and interstate relations. This implies, naturally, due account both of the differences in the political institutions of the countries with different social systems, and of the accumulated traditions and the exclusion of interference in the internal affairs of other nations and states.

Cultural ties and exchanges of spiritual values, cooperation in science, education, sports, medicine, etc. play an important role in present-day international life. This set of questions has also taken its place in the programme of the comprehensive system of international security set forth by the 27th CPSU Congress.

It was written already by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels in the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* that isolation would be inevitably replaced by all-round ties between nations: "The intellectual creations of individual nations become common property. National one-sidedness and narrow-mindedness become more and more impossible..."²

Because of a number of objective factors inherent in the 20th century these prophetic words have become even more relevant today. The first of them is the awakening of the multi-million masses to cultural life as a

² Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. One, Moscow, Progress Publishers, 1976, p. 112.

result of the victory of socialist revolutions first in Russia and then in a number of other states. The intensification of mankind's spiritual life and international cultural ties was encouraged yet by another important process of the second half of the 20th century—the collapse of imperialism's colonial system, the formation of dozens of young independent states. They spare no effort to achieve national, including cultural revival, to develop ties with other countries. Progress along this road achieved by the countries of socialist orientation is especially impressive. Scientific and technological progress, especially in the sphere of mass media, exerts a strong influence on the scope of cultural ties.

So, the mainstays for a steady development of international cultural exchanges are diverse. On its part, the Soviet Union welcomes and encourages in every way this process and invariably orients itself at its deepening and expansion because this policy accords with the principled policy of the Soviet state founded on the humanistic idea of communism both as an ideology and a social system. "Only a precise knowledge and transformation of the culture created by the entire development of mankind will enable us to create a proletarian culture",³ V. I. Lenin stressed.

The Soviet Union maintains cultural ties with most countries of the world. Intergovernmental agreements and exchange programmes have been signed with more than a hundred of them. Of the total volume of cultural ties about a half are with allied socialist countries and its scale has trebled during the past twenty years. On the basis of reciprocity the Soviet Union readily shares its cultural accomplishments with the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, helps them in setting up institutions of culture and in the training of national personnel.

Cultural ties hold a special place in the intercourse of the European nations. And this is quite natural because the European continent has a wealth of cultural traditions and presented the world with Homer, Shakespeare, Leonardo da Vinci and Rafael, Mozart and Goethe, Pushkin, Tolstoy and Tchaikovsky. The historical intertwining of the destinies and cultures of the neighbour-nations, the shared or related languages, the extensive economic and social ties, large-scale tourism—all this has turned spiritual intercourse into a substantial factor in the life of the Europeans.

After the lengthy rupture of European cultural ties caused by the Second World War and later on by the cold war the yearning of the continent's peoples for their restoration and development manifested itself during the past decades with particular vigour. In the 1960s and 1970s the European countries concluded many agreements in this field. Exchanges of performers, exhibitions, etc. are now routine. This trend made itself felt also during the preparations for, and holding of, the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe at which problems of cultural cooperation held a prominent place.

The programme of cultural ties between states, adopted as a section of the Final Act, is vast in terms of its directions and forms of cooperation. It provides for the development on the basis of relevant agreements of bilateral and multilateral cultural ties between state institutions, professional organisations and cultural workers, for giving citizens the best possible access to the treasures of world culture, for the promotion of translations of literature into other languages, for holding film festivals and the encouragement of such forms of cultural cooperation as book exhibitions and fairs, international events in the field of art, theatre, music, folk art, etc.

The first years after Helsinki witnessed a rather intensive and stable growth of inter-European cultural ties. Millions of people remember to

³ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, Moscow, Progress Publishers, 1974, p. 287.

this day the mutual guest performances in those years by outstanding companies and art exhibitions. Also at the time there was a rapid growth of East-West film exchanges and a visible intensification of personal contacts among cultural figures.

This favourable development was substantially undermined at the very beginning of the 1980s by Washington with its policy of impeding detente accompanied by a scaling down of cultural and public ties with socialist countries and attempts to boycott them and draw the West European countries into this boycott. Some of them, and this does not do them any credit, followed the US lead and froze their ties with the Soviet Union. This evoked deep dissatisfaction among prominent figures in culture and art in the West.

It is apt to recall here that this was not the first ever attempt in history to impede normal and natural ties between culture and art workers in Western Europe and their colleagues in the Soviet Union. It was already soon after the Great October Socialist Revolution that the reactionary forces in Europe and the United States tried to organise a "cultural boycott" of Soviet Russia that was strongly opposed by such giants of world literature as Bernard Shaw, Romain Rolland, Martin Andersen Nexo, Theodore Dreiser and others. The famous French scientist Paul Langevin remarked that without Russia Europe ceases to be Europe. Indeed, how can one possibly "excommunicate" from world culture Maxim Gorky, Dmitry Shostakovich, Sergei Eisenstein, Galina Ulanova and Mikhail Sholokhov?

This time again Washington's attempts to disorganise international cultural ties, to put them in disarray had ended in failure. Their revival was started already in 1982. Since then the Soviet Union has signed new intergovernmental agreements and programmes of cultural exchanges with most West European countries. And this process continues. A bilateral agreement on cultural and scientific ties was signed after an interval of many years during the Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva in November 1985. Cultural exchanges with Canada have been resumed, talks on a new agreement are in progress with the FRG, etc.

The publication of foreign literature in the Soviet Union, first of all of books from the participating countries of the European Conference, gives an idea of the attention paid in the USSR to acquainting the broad masses of the population with foreign culture. The printing of books by foreign authors in the USSR has almost doubled in the years since Helsinki and now amounts to some 150 million copies a year. The mass printing has been completed of the 200-volume "Library of World Literature" of which 137 volumes contain works by 2,600 foreign authors. Nearing completion is the 50-volume "Library of World Literature for Children". Five volumes of "European Poetry" (in languages of the original and in Russian), the collection of poetry "Europe 20th Century", etc., were published in direct connection with the Helsinki accords.

At the same time it seems to be appropriate to dwell on some circumstances that create certain obstacles to a more extensive development of equal and mutually advantageous international cultural cooperation. First of all it concerns reciprocity, something that some of the Western partners often lack. A clear disproportion between socialist and capitalist countries in publishing books, in showing films, television programmes, etc. remains to this day. For example, the Soviet Union publishes two-four times more books by Western writers than the number of books by Soviet writers published in the West. As to the number of copies, these figures are simply beyond comparison. According to UNESCO statistics Soviet television shows roughly three times more Western programmes than vice versa. During the regular Moscow international film festival

alone more Western films are shown in the Soviet Union than the number of Soviet films shown in Western countries in the course of years.

The continuing and even expanding "psychological warfare" waged by Washington and several other NATO countries against the Soviet Union is another negative factor. It fully involves the sphere of culture and is being conducted by radio and television, through literature and cinematography. Anticommunist publications, films and television programmes are increasingly appearing in the West. Instead of books by Soviet writers the Western reader is offered "works" by renegades expelled from their countries. So transition to a more extensive international cultural cooperation should be conducted parallel to the clearing of the barricades left by the "psychological war". Cultural ties, just as scientific and other contacts, should not serve the aims hostile to other countries, and the ideology of anti-communism. Great vistas will open up in this case for the spiritual intercourse of nations and individuals, given a developed infrastructure of bilateral and multilateral agreements and the required international mechanisms in the form of the UN and UNESCO agencies and hundreds of intergovernmental and non-governmental organisations. But the main thing is that every nation has such accomplishments in the field of culture, science, art, education and sport which are of universal value and should become an asset of the entire mankind.

No country has ever set so seriously and fundamentally the task of developing international humanitarian interaction as a paramount direction of the struggle for universal security, mutual understanding and cooperation. This approach by the 27th CPSU Congress has evoked great interest in many countries of the world. The importance and consequences of this initiative just as of the entire concept of the all-embracing system of international security set forth by the Soviet Union, are being analysed to this day. The sooner politicians and parties, the public, the business circles, people prominent in science and culture realise the entire scope and lofty humanism of this concept, the better it will be for the cause of peace.

It was stressed in the Political Report of the Central Committee to the 27th CPSU Congress that the main trend of the struggle in contemporary conditions consists "in creating worthy, truly human material and spiritual conditions of life for all nations, ensuring that our planet should be habitable, and in cultivating a caring attitude towards its riches, especially to man himself - the greatest treasure, and all his potentials".⁴ Herein lies the key to understanding the humanistic essence of the foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state.

⁴ Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 27th Party Congress, p. 27.

COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Znaniye", 1986

English translation COPYRIGHT: Progress Publishers 1986

/9274

CSO: 1812/082

EAST-WEST RELATIONS

ASSESSMENT, DOCUMENT OF STOCKHOLM CONFERENCE

Results Assessed

Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS in English No 12, Dec 87 pp 131-133, 151

[Article by Yuri Rakhmaninov]

[Text]

The first stage of the Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe came officially to a close in Stockholm on September 19, 1986 (to conclude it in actual fact, the "clock was stopped" and the final plenary meeting prolonged till September 22). An important component of the general European process, the conference opened on January 17, 1984, as decided by the Madrid follow-up meeting on September 6, 1983. According to the provisions of the Concluding Document, the "conference mandate", formulated in Madrid, the task of the participants in the Stockholm forum was to discuss and approve a set of mutually complementary confidence- and security-building measures in order to reduce the danger of military confrontation in Europe.

The follow-up (third) meeting of the participating states of the CSCE, which opened in Vienna on November 4, 1986, is to discuss ways and means of continuing efforts in the sphere of security and disarmament, including the issue of the mandate of the follow-up (second) stage of the Stockholm Conference, which is to discuss and adopt security and disarmament measures in Europe.

In practical terms, the document approved in Stockholm is an elaborate set of political and military measures intended to lessen the danger of military confrontation in Europe, the most heavily armed continent. It specifies and gives effect to the principle of non-use of force; furthermore, it contains confidence- and security- building measures in the military field.

The Stockholm document includes an accord between the participants in the CSCE on non-use of force or the threat of force in any form, including the most dangerous form, armed force. Thus a substantive step has been taken to make this commitment an effective law of international relations which no one may violate.

The participating countries have committed themselves to give prior notification 42 days in advance of the start of all exercises by ground troops in combination with air or naval components whenever over 13,000 troops and 300 battle tanks are involved. With regard to air force exercises, a special sublimit has been established: 200 sorties by aircraft in the course of the exercises; beginning with it, the necessary information will be supplied. Experts estimate that this virtually covers 90 per cent of air force activity in Europe.

Prior notification will be given by states on exercises as well as on troop movements, transfers and concentrations. This implies, in particular, that from now on the United States will have to give notification of every transfer of its troops to Europe in excess of the strength mentioned above. It is evident that such accords help reduce the hazard of military conflict and hence make for a more tranquil and stable situation in Europe.

The countries concerned will exchange annual plans of their military activities that are subject to prior notification. This is one of the most important sections of the agreement; it shows how very far the participants in the CSCE will go to meet each other half-way in order to remove mutual suspicion and change the tenor of thinking from military to peaceful.

Beginning with the 17,000 troop limit, observers are to be invited to every military activity, whether an exercise, a movement or a transfer of troops. As these invitation are obligatory, all participating countries will be able to satisfy themselves that the military activity in question conforms to the accord on prior notification and threatens no one. Agreement has been also reached on some elements of limiting military exercises. However, this is only a beginning, and the theme will be elaborated and carried deeper afterwards.

The provisions concerning inspection are among the most important parts of the Stockholm accords. This issue has been, and indeed remains, a stumbling-block in many disarmament talks. Not without malicious intent, it has been rumoured that the Soviet Union objected to any control and would never allow inspectors into its territory.

The Stockholm document has refuted that false rumour. Where there is an object of serious agreement, whether on disarmament or confidence-building measures, the Soviet Union, naturally, is interested as much as other countries in all states unfailingly meeting their commitments. Our country agreed along with others that each state situated in the area covered by the confidence-building measures should allow no more than three inspections per calendar year on its territory. In coming to terms on this, account was taken, of course, of the legitimate security interests of states. No inspections will be conducted in restricted areas, or at military and other defence installations. It is, in effect, the first agreement on armaments in history providing for on-site inspection.

There are four annexes to the Stockholm document which concern the following: (1) the zone of application for confidence- and security-building measures; it will cover the whole of Europe as well as the adjoining sea area (in this context, the notion of adjoining sea area refers also to ocean areas adjoining Europe) and to its air space; (2) the date of entry into force of the accords on exchanging annual plans for military activities and restrictive provisions; (3) a statement by the chairman of the plenary meeting that each participating state can raise any question consistent with the conference mandate at any stage subsequent to the Vienna CSCE follow-up meeting; (4) the stipulation that inspection on the territory of a participating state can not be conducted by its allies which are participants in the CSCE.

The Stockholm conference failed to come to terms on all the issues whose settlement would have fully ensured the laying of solid foundations for confidence and security in Europe. However, the results of the Stockholm forum are the maximum of what is possible at present, and they can serve as the starting point for working out new effective solutions conducive to real disarmament in Europe.

By adopting agreed confidence-building measures in the military sphere, the conference created important prerequisites for a more favourable climate of confidence and security in Europe. Indeed, the political aspects of European security will now rest on broader foundations of restrictive

measures in the military field than before. This certainly makes the preservation of peace and the promotion of cooperation in Europe more dependable.

At the same time, new prospects and opportunities are opening up for extending the Stockholm accords on confidence- and security-building measures to other continents, which would undoubtedly contribute to the establishment of a comprehensive international security system.

The results of the forum held in the Swedish capital carry forward in practice the Helsinki Final Act with due regard to present-day political and military realities in Europe. As a matter of fact, they constitute the first agreement within the framework of the far-reaching programme for peace, disarmament and security advanced by the Soviet Union in the Statement which the General Secretary of the CPSU CC made on January 15, 1986.

The accords reached in Stockholm were made possible by the steadfast efforts of socialist countries, neutral and non-aligned states, of all participants in the conference, by the political realism and sense of responsibility which they showed. This enabled them to overcome many barriers and difficulties in seeking a compromise based on a mutually acceptable balance of the security interests of all participating countries.

The state of affairs at the conference was constantly in the focus of attention of the leaderships of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. The Stockholm forum also held a prominent place during meetings of leaders of the Warsaw Treaty countries.

Summit meetings and talks, such as the exchange of views between Soviet and French leaders early in July 1986, played an important part in the attainment of positive results in Stockholm. This also applies to talks between the Foreign Ministers of the Soviet Union, Britain, Italy, the FRG and other European countries. The problem of reaching agreement in Stockholm was among the subjects discussed during the September meeting between Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and US Secretary of State George Shultz. These efforts produced the Stockholm document on confidence- and security-building measures.

"The Soviet leadership", says Mikhail Gorbachev's Statement on the results of the Stockholm Conference, "takes a positive view of the results of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures in Europe. A big step has been taken towards easing tensions and creating a healthier international political climate, which is so necessary for the solution of vitally important problems of this nuclear age.

"It is a victory for common sense, a gain for all the thirty-five countries which participated in the conference. They proved equal to rising above differences and achieving accords which are important in themselves and, furthermore, are improving the outlook for bringing about a stable situation in Europe. The Stockholm success can serve to extend the atmosphere of confidence at international level as well.

"The Soviet Union sees in this agreement the sprouts of a new way of thinking in world politics that are shooting forth on European soil. Stockholm has proved that even in a complicated situation it is possible to come to terms on security issues provided there is a desire and political will. It is an example of how the new edifice of detente and new relations between states can and should be built".

The Stockholm accords are evidence that the policy of detente has large potentialities and that the logic of confrontation has had its day while the trend towards lasting peace has deep roots and is essentially irreversible. They provide a favourable basis for further headway towards a stage-by-stage realisation of effective and concrete actions aimed at promoting and

intensifying the general European process as a whole started over ten years ago in the Finnish capital.

The results of the Stockholm Conference are important for the Vienna meeting of the CSCE participating states. They are an earnest of success in starting the second stage of the Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe. The Vienna CSCE meeting should help bring about new important accords in all the spheres envisaged by the Helsinki Final Act. It should be used for carrying forward the many-sided European process in order to solve the problems of concern to all Europeans.

Interested in the achievement of positive results at Vienna as they are, the Soviet Union and the other fraternal socialist countries consider that European security should be based on a set of mutually complementary confidence- and security-building measures in the political and military spheres, real steps towards disarmament in Europe and a system of cooperation between countries in the political, economic, scientific, technological, cultural, humanitarian and other spheres on the principles of peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems. Such cooperation provides a solid material basis for European security. In all these spheres, the Helsinki accords meet the objective requirements of the fast-growing internationalisation of the economic, political and cultural activity of nations as a result of scientific and technological progress.

There is no doubt that Europe can and should contribute actively to the effort to bring about a sharp turn in favour of the policy of peace and detente. It has ample and instructive historical experience and should set an inspiring example in this matter.

Text of Document

[Editorial report] Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS in English No 12, December 87 publishes on pages 134-143 the text of the 19 September 1986 Document of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe Convened in Accordance with the Relevant Provisions of the Concluding Document of the Madrid Meeting of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Znaniye", 1986
English Translation COPYRIGHT: Progress Publishers 1986

CSO:1812/087

EAST-WEST RELATIONS

CSCE INITIATIVES IN VIENNA VIEWED

Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 5, 8-15 Feb 87 p 4

[Article by Yuri Bandura]

[Text] After more than a month-long interval the Vienna meeting of the states which participated in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe has resumed its work in the Austrian capital. It is the third such meeting in the European process which commenced in Helsinki in 1975.

THE FORUM's goal is not only to assess the results of the Helsinki Final Act over the three-year period since the previous, Madrid, meeting, but to stimulate fresh opportunities for Europe to consolidate peace and good-neighbourliness.

Possibilities exist. Even at the first stage of the Vienna meeting (which completed its work last December 18), a number of initiatives were made - initiatives that could essentially fill up each of the three Helsinki "baskets" - one dealing with security questions, another with trade and economic relations, and the other concerning problems of humanitarian cooperation. It was suggested that delegations from 35 states should discuss the following proposals:

- on the convocation in Moscow of a conference on the questions of humanitarian cooperation, including contacts between people, questions of information, culture and education (proposed by the USSR);
- on the convocation in Prague of an economic forum to consider the promising directions and forums of economic cooperation in Europe (proposed by Czechoslovakia jointly with some other countries);
- on the conduct of a scientists' forum to work out new forms of scientific and technical cooperation (proposed by Italy);
- on the organization of an ecological forum to be attended, among others, by representatives of ecological movements (proposed by Bulgaria);
- on the ratification of the Human Rights Covenants by all the states participating in the European process (proposed by Poland).

Not much time remains for discussions: by July 31, 1987 the participants in the Vienna meeting should have worked out a final document. But there is some time. The question is how it will be used.

This is not an idle question because no enthusiasm is visible so far on the part of the delegations of the NATO countries. The US delegation arrived in Vienna with only two "initiatives" in its portfolio. The first suggests nominating three "prominent citizens" from each participating country so that they can tour Europe to check the fulfilment of the Helsinki accords; the second calls for an end to radio jamming (not a very timely demand - the air was made open for the BBC a few days ago).

Such "initiatives" produce the impression that Washington, and some of its allies, would like in general to leave the politico-military and trade-economic "baskets" in the backyard of European life, while turning the Helsinki process itself into a "court trial on human rights".

Not a serious venture. Even without prompting from without, important legislative and administrative measures are being taken in our country on the further development of international contacts, on a humanitarian solution to questions of the reunification of families and the conclusion of mixed marriages. The latest example of this is the additional Regulations concerning entering and leaving the USSR, which came into force on January 1 of this year (MN told about this in its issue No.4, 1987). The Soviet Union's actions in this direction are an

organic continuation of the course towards the democratization of every aspect of Soviet life, a course towards the democratization of state-to-state relations.

At the previous, Madrid, meeting, all 35 states unanimously endorsed a mandate for the Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe. The first stage of that conference (known as Stockholm-1) ended successfully, having laid the foundation for new specific and effective actions. Next in turn will be Stockholm-2. At this stage the conference could also consider the balanced programme for European disarmament, put forward last summer in Budapest at a conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty Member-States.

The ways to the solution of this problem were traced in Vienna by the delegation from Poland. The draft of the Polish document suggests, among other things, that Stockholm-2 should be instructed to consider the questions of confidence-building measures and of disarmament in parallel, not confining itself exclusively to confidence-building problems. This approach has been highly appraised by the majority of the participants in the Vienna-meeting. But not by NATO.

The declaration adopted by the NATO

Council session on December 11, 1986, suggests, that, instead of talks on a real reduction of the armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe, there be a discussion on the alleged "imbalance" between the military potentials of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization, which could, as past experience testifies, drag on for many years. Moreover, the "Brussels declaration", in general, would take the questions of disarmament beyond the confines of the European process, beyond the confines of Vienna and Stockholm. In other words, according to the plans of NATO, all the neutral and non-aligned countries of the Old World are denied any right to take part in shaping their own or even the continent's destiny.

From such positions it is impossible to ensure either an assured peaceful future of any kind or democratization of international relations in Europe. And if the powers-that-be in the NATO capitals are really concerned that there be peace and security on the European continent, NATO's aforementioned positions have to be changed. It would not be a retreat - but an advance forward towards a non-nuclear 21st century. It would be an advance for our small planet Earth.

/9317
CSO: 1812/74

EAST-WEST RELATIONS

EEC-SOVIET TALKS IN BRUSSELS ON OFFICIAL RELATIONS

Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 5, 9 Feb 87 pp 6-8

[Article by Mikhail Yakovlev]

[Text:]

THE FIRST MEETING BETWEEN A DELEGATION OF SOVIET EXPERTS AND THE COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES (CEC) WAS HELD IN BRUSSELS ON JANUARY 15-16.

The meeting discussed the procedure for establishing official relations between the Soviet Union and three European Communities: the European Economic Community (EEC), the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC), and Eurecom.

Below Yuri Buzykin, head of the Soviet delegation at the meeting, is interviewed by New Times.

What prompted the dialogue to establish official relations between the U.S.S.R. and the European Communities (EC)?

The meeting of experts in Brussels followed an exchange of letters between Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and Willy de Clercq who is responsible for the CEC's foreign relations. A more detailed discussion was made possible and even necessary by the resumption of talks

between the CMEA and the EEC. We expect the talks to continue and lead to the early establishment of official relations.

The two major organizations for economic integration in the world are exerting a considerable influence on the development of individual European countries, as well as on international trade and politics. Like some leaders of the Commission member countries, we proceed from the assumption that the states of Europe have mutually complementary economic structures. Because integration processes are on the upgrade in each of the two groups of states, it is only logical for the two organizations and their member countries to establish contacts. So, when the Commission of the European Communities indicated that it would be interested in establishing official relations with the Soviet Union, we said we would be ready to do so after or concurrently with the establishment of official direct relations between the CMEA and the EEC.

There is now talk of dialogue between the two international organizations. What bearing does this have on relations between the European Communities and the Soviet Union?

The establishment of official relations between the CMEA and the EEC is of direct relevance to the individual members of the two international organizations, including the Soviet Union. As far as I know, this point of view is shared by the Commission of the European Communities and the representatives of the individual countries within the Commission. The establishment of official relations between the U.S.S.R. and the European Communities, which is being negotiated simultaneously with the dialogue between the CMEA and the EEC, will pave the way for cooperation in diverse areas. Mutually acceptable agreements on economic, scientific and technical cooperation, including trade, will be drawn up and concluded. This will require direct contacts between the

Soviet organizations concerned and the CEC.

They will be all the more necessary because the U.S.S.R. is currently reforming its foreign economic activity by establishing direct links between Soviet enterprises and foreign partners, creating joint enterprises and international associations. Direct links between the European Communities and their member countries may open up new and promising prospects.

Would it be true to say that the development of bilateral ties in Europe is directly linked with multilateral cooperation?

Yes. Europe has come a long way and overcome serious obstacles on the path to multilateral cooperation. The Helsinki Final Act of 1975, and last year's Stockholm accords on confidence measures were milestones. Yet it all started with bilateral contacts and progress in establishing political, trade

and economic ties between individual countries in Eastern and Western Europe. Clearly, if the Soviet Union did not cooperate with EC states in various areas, it would be unrealistic to talk of official relations between Moscow and Brussels.

On the other hand, the establishment of official relations with the European Communities will boost cooperation with individual European countries.

The results of the first meeting of experts in Brussels are promising. They have by and large agreed on the procedure for the establishment of official relations between the EC and the U.S.S.R. and clarified the corresponding diplomatic procedures. It is also important that the meeting was marked by a constructive spirit and has been seen as productive by both sides. We have agreed to continue the negotiations should the need arise.

/9317
CSO: 1812/77

SOCIALIST COMMUNITY AND CMEA AFFAIRS

RESULTS OF COORDINATION OF CMEA ECONOMIC PLANS

Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS in English No 12, Dec 86 pp 18-25

[Article by Valeri Andreyev and Vladimir Samovol]

[Text]

This year's congresses of the fraternal parties of socialist countries stressed the urgency of gearing the economy mainly to intensive development, which means accelerating scientific and technological progress, widely using its achievements in the economy, mobilising all organisational, economic and social reserves, and raising the social productivity of labour.

Reality demands that the socialist community countries step up their economic cooperation to a considerable degree by shifting the emphasis from trade to cooperation in production, science and technology. The task is to greatly raise the effectiveness of both internal economic development and mutual economic cooperation. This requires a creative search for new ways and means of managing economic processes on a planned basis and of coordinating national economic plans.

There is now every reason to speak of a totality of forms of joined planned activity by the socialist countries in close connection with the national planning and economic management system of each particular country. All CMEA countries consider that coordination of five year economic plans, geared to the new requirements, is the principal method of planned organisation of their economic, scientific and technological co-operation and integration and that this also applies to the foreseeable future. This is because five year plans play a key role in economic management within the socialist community.

Coordination of economic plans for the current five year period has been carried out in accordance with the agreed strategic decisions of the latest CMEA economic summit, bilateral long term programmes for economic, scientific and technological cooperation, and the Comprehensive Programme for the Scientific and Technological Progress of the CMEA Member States through the Year 2000. The Economic Summit recognised the need to raise the efficiency of the mechanism of coordinating plans. Its documents say that in coordinating national economic plans, the member states will concentrate on priorities and that coordination will be the chief instrument for shaping durable relations between CMEA countries in the economic, scientific and technological spheres and the basis for the drafting by the cooperating countries of national plans in so far as these concern cooperation.

In conformity with the decisions of the Economic Summit, the fraternal countries and CMEA agencies are now working to improve the coordination of economic plans. The main purpose of this effort is to elaborate cooperation guidelines contributing decisively to the promotion of national production, mutual economic ties and the international division of labour.

CMEA bodies have approved a series of important organisational and technical documents with a view to carrying out decisions of the Economic Summit on coordinating national economic plans on a multilateral basis and in close connection with cooperation in science and technology.

In coordinating plans, the member countries specified the volume and pattern of deliveries as well as the details of reciprocal services with due regard to the potentialities and requirements of the parties concerned.

Mutual trade turnover of the USSR with European member states of CMEA in the period 1986-1990 will reach approximately (in billions of rubles): with Bulgaria 70, with Hungary 51, with the GDR 82, Poland 74, Romania 36 and Czechoslovakia 73. The growth of Soviet trade with these countries will amount to 30 to 70 per cent as compared with the previous five-year period. Trade between other socialist countries will grow as follows: Bulgaria—GDR, 22 per cent, Hungary—Poland, more than 34 per cent, and Romania—Czechoslovakia, 41 per cent.

One of the main tasks set by the Moscow Economic Summit for the present stage of advance in cooperation is to make coordination of national economic plans the chief instrument for coordinating the fraternal countries' economic policies. Certain steps to this end were taken in coordinating plans for the 1986-1990 period. To date the member states have signed over 20 bilateral programmes for economic, scientific and technological cooperation through the year 2000. Specifically, the Soviet Union has concluded relevant agreements with all the other CMEA countries. Long-term bilateral programmes are being carried out, for instance, in the area of specialisation and cooperation in production.

Multilateral coordination of economic policies has resulted in the drafting and adoption of cooperation programmes such as "Long-term Comprehensive Measures for Cooperation in Energy Production, Fuel and Raw Materials Until 1990 and Beyond", the programme of measures for the comprehensive development and provision of transport communications between CMEA member states and for the coordination of joint actions in this sphere through 1990, and several other programmes. A general pattern has evolved for the long-range advancement of the electric power industry within integrated power systems of the CMEA countries through the year 2000, and there is also a programme for the construction of atomic power stations before the end of this century with due regard to the possibilities of supplying them with nuclear fuel and the requisite plant. Very important in terms of implementing a long-term scientific and technological policy are the large-scale agreements that have been signed, including agreements on developing and introducing flexible production system and automated design complexes, on developing microprocessors, robots and light conduits, on using natural gas as motor fuel, and so on.

In coordinating five-year economic plans, steps were also taken to harmonise important aspects of the long-term social and economic development of the CMEA countries. There were exchanges of information on the basic proportions and trends of reciprocal trade, investment policy trends and cooperation in reconstructing and retooling production.

We have pointed out that in regard to economic policy fraternal party congresses put emphasis on the need to accelerate scientific and technological progress as the main prerequisite for a thorough transformation of the productive forces of society and its material and technical base. This

is why, in coordinating plans, special attention was given to the problem of organising multilateral cooperation in fields crucial for technological progress. A major component of this activity today is the development of a coordinated, and in some fields a common scientific and technological policy.

A stride of fundamental significance in accomplishing this task was the adoption of the Comprehensive Programme for the Scientific and Technological Progress (mentioned earlier) by the extraordinary 41st CMEA Session in December 1985. The Programme sets out the perspectives for accelerating the intensification of production, greatly increasing its efficiency in fraternal countries and reaching advanced positions in science and technology. Concrete and specific in nature, the Programme made it possible even during the Moscow session of the CMEA to agree to include the tasks, for the period through 1990 formulated by the session, in the economic plans for the current five-year period which the member countries are drafting. About 700 research centres of the community countries are to be brought into solving 93 major problems set by the Programme. This year will see the results of research into 11 problems put to use in production, and by the end of the current five-year period about 80 per cent of all research projects is expected to find an application in the production sphere.

The pace of retooling the economy on the basis of the latest scientific and technological achievements will depend to a decisive extent on progress in mechanical engineering, which conditions the development of other economic fields. In coordinating plans, the fraternal countries agreed on a multilateral basis on the main development lines of the leading branches of engineering. They devoted considerable attention to the problem of raising the technological and economic standards and quality of output delivered reciprocally and of using the achievements of science and technology in production. As a result of collective efforts, reciprocal deliveries will include more items produced by the industries determining scientific and technological progress and contributing to its acceleration. Deliveries of engineering products from the USSR will increase by 50 per cent, and their share in Soviet exports to CMEA member countries will rise from 16.7 per cent in 1985 to over 21 per cent in 1990. The import of machines from fraternal countries will also increase at a high rate, its total volume the current five-year period reaching approximately 100,000 million rubles.

To make integrational cooperation more effective and put the results of joint projects to use in production as speedily as possible, the socialist countries have proceeded to draw up more cooperation agreements of a comprehensive character covering the whole cycle: science—production—reciprocal deliveries. As a result, flexible computer-controlled production systems, transfer lines, robotics, metal-cutting machine tools with numerical control, microelectronics and microprocessors, an up-to-date metallurgical plant, highly efficient machinery and other equipment for the agro-industrial complex and the light industry, plants for the chemical, oil and petrochemical industries will come to hold an important place in reciprocal deliveries of engineering industry products in the current five-year period.

Documents concerning the results of coordinated plans, long-term trade agreements and treaties of international specialisation and cooperation in production provide for reciprocal commitments to raise the technological standard of production. They set deadlines for the replacement or modernisation of obsolete products and define the parameters of new or improved articles meeting the highest world standards. Agreement has been reached on which machinery and equipment will undergo technological and economic improvement while the relevant agreements are in force.

In the context of comprehensive intensification of social production, an important line of improvement is also the technological renewal of the means of production with a view to saving resources. The agreed economic development strategy of the fraternal countries calls for a 50 to 100 per cent reduction of material and power intensity by the year 2000. In the case of the Soviet economy, it is planned to meet over 75 per cent of fuel, power, raw materials and other requirements by conserving on resources.

The problem of cooperation in the development and application of progressive resource-saving technologies held a prominent place in the coordination of plans for the current five years. In particular, the member countries decided to use economical electric locomotives with a low rate of power consumption, to make diesel locomotives, trucks and buses driven by liquefied gas and build steam and gas installations making it possible to save fuel during transportation (the energy of 1,000 million cubic metres of natural gas equals that of 700,000 to 800,000 tons of gasoline, which takes from four to five million tons of oil to produce).

Close attention was paid in coordinating plans to the strategic task of supplying the economy of the community with fuel and raw materials. Reciprocal deliveries of power resources and raw materials are an important factor besides the use of the CMEA countries' own resources for the solution of the problem of fuel, power and raw materials. The coordination of plans made it possible to create the essential conditions for meeting the fuel, power and raw materials requirements of the fraternal states.

In most countries the adoption of a policy of saving power and effecting progressive changes in the pattern of power consumption will help reduce fuel and power consumption in the 1986-1990 period compared with the previous five years. The 40th CMEA Session approved a programme for cooperation in economical and rational utilisation of material resources through the year 2000. The programme is aimed at using important fuel, power and raw materials resources more effectively by extending international cooperation in this field. Its fulfilment will make possible a large saving in material resources and will lower the power and material intensity of national incomes of the socialist community countries.

Further progressive changes are to be effected in electricity production. The number of atomic power stations will increase. Water and alternative power resources are to be utilised to a greater measure. With the joint construction of the Khrushnitsky and South Ukrainian atomic power stations in the Soviet Union by 1990 as well as of the 750 kV Khrushnitsky atomic power station (USSR)--Rzeszow (Poland) power line and the 750 kV South Ukrainian atomic power station (USSR)--Isaccea (Romania)--Dobrudza (Bulgaria) line this country will begin to supply European members of the CMEA with about 65 per cent more electric power.

To increase natural gas deliveries from the Soviet Union to European member countries of the CMEA, the states concerned are organising co-operation in the development of the Yamburg gas deposits and the construction of a gas line over 4,600 kilometres long from Yamburg to the western frontier of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the GDR and Hungary have already signed relevant bilateral agreements. When the line is completed, gas deliveries to European CMEA countries can be increased by close to 35 per cent.

In coordinating plans for the 1986-1990 period Czechoslovakia, the GDR, Hungary, Romania and the Soviet Union signed a multilateral agreement on cooperation in building the Krivoy Rog oxidised ore concentrating complex. The complex will mine and concentrate about 30 million tons of oxidised ferruginous quartzites and produce an annual 12.8 million tons of iron ore pellets from them. By way of contributing their share, the Soviet Union's CMEA partners will fully build installations, deliver the requisite machinery and other materials.

With a view to creating favourable economic conditions guaranteeing mutually beneficial cooperation and in line with a decision adopted by the Moscow Economic Summit, CMEA countries will, in exchange for raw materials and power resources, export to the Soviet Union food products, industrial consumer goods, structural materials, machinery and other equipment meeting world technological standards. Accordingly, European CMEA countries will develop appropriate industries and make the necessary investments.

Plan coordination for the current five-year period is characterised primarily by a more pronounced social trend. Among other things, the fraternal countries are to cooperate more closely in producing items of the agroindustrial complex, improving the raw material supply of industries producing consumer goods and foodstuffs, and developing the light industry as well as the printing and timber industries. There will be more extensive cooperation in the retooling and reconstruction of factories producing consumer goods; the list of products exchanged through interstate and border trade and through consumers' cooperatives will increase. In various sectors of the agroindustrial complex there is to be multilateral cooperation in conformity with comprehensive cooperation measures intended to improve the food supply of the CMEA countries.

In coordinating plans for the 1986-1990 period, much attention was also given to the need to accelerate and raise the efficiency of the economies of Vietnam, Cuba and Mongolia with due regard to the socialist industrialisation tasks facing them, and to steps to draw them into the international socialist division of labour on a larger scale. These countries are therefore to develop export industries geared to meeting the requirements of other members of the socialist community.

The Comprehensive Programme for Scientific and Technological Progress offers appreciable opportunities for the economic advancement of Vietnam, Cuba and Mongolia. To encourage these countries' participation in fulfilling the Programme, they will be granted easy terms ensuring the early application of scientific and technological achievements in production.

The Communist and Workers' Parties of the CMEA countries are constantly searching for new forms of promoting integrational cooperation leading to closer cooperation in science and production and hence to more rapid scientific and technological progress. They do much to extend direct ties between enterprises, combines and economic organisations of the member states. At present they are engaged in creating proper conditions in the sphere of planning, organisation, currency, finance and law, for co-operation in science and production on the basis of direct ties. The Soviet Union has adopted decisions "On Measures to Improve Management of Foreign Economic Ties" and "On Measures to Perfect Management of Economic, Scientific and Technological Cooperation with Socialist Countries" which envisage some major moves in this area. They attach great importance to setting up joint combines, designers' offices and laboratories. Last year the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia established Robot, an international scientific and technological combine. Also, two Soviet-Bulgarian scientific-production combines were put into operation in the machine-tool industry. A multilateral agreement was signed on establishing Interrobot, an international scientific-production combine. Of course, these are only offshoots of new forms of integration but the future belongs to them, as the 27th CPSU Congress pointed out.

What is particularly urgent in this context is the need to evolve appropriate forms of guaranteeing on a planned basis the implementation of the Comprehensive Programme for Scientific and Technological Progress and to make plan coordination an effective instrument of agreeing on eco-

nomic, scientific and technological policies. This task should be accomplished by combining macroeconomic methods of cooperation with methods of planned cooperation between direct participants in the production process, that is, combines, enterprises and other entities. Involvement of the main economic echelons in the coordination and adoption of decisions on the organisation of integrational cooperation offers tremendous opportunity for substantially improving cooperation.

To promote cooperation at medium level and microlevel, it is essential to specify the areas of plan coordination and focus the attention of central planning bodies on solving strategic problems of cooperation, agreeing on common economic development concepts and specifying ways and means of implementing the economic, scientific and technological policy. The next stage of coordination, a more concrete one, should cover problems of agreeing on a planned basis on the development of individual industries and subindustries with due regard for the results of macroeconomic coordination. These problems include primarily specialisation and cooperation in science and production and the drawing up of cooperation programmes aimed at advancing production by modernising and reconstructing it, as well as the procedure and terms of delivering output. It is on this level that direct ties between the CMEA countries' economic organisations have been developing.

A practice that has gained ground within the CMEA is the drafting of long-term agreements on cooperation in developing various industries and production sectors in which the latest scientific and technological achievements are used most effectively. Such agreements could be the basis for planned cooperation between the national and international combines, complexes, enterprises, research centres and other entities concerned. Thereby they could operate as subjects of coordination of national economic plans at microlevel. Such coordination would form the pivot of ensuring direct links between the main economic echelons of CMEA countries according to plan. For the time being, the processes of coordinating plans and developing direct links still take place largely in isolation from one another. The difference in their levels is one of the reasons for this state of affairs.

At present CMEA agencies are working to improve the cooperation mechanism at microlevel and to form elements of cooperation conducive to further scientific and technological integration. The CMEA Committee on Cooperation in Planning is working at comprehensive proposals of a practical nature to create plan, organisational, monetary, financial and legal incentives for the expansion of cooperation in production, science and technology and for direct links within the CMEA. The proposals include the assignment of one of the partner organisations to work on preparing variants of cooperation and drafting appropriate agreements, contracts and treaties. This idea was carried forward in the jointly advanced concept of a head entity functioning as the central organising and coordinating link of the system of managing the implementation of the Comprehensive Programme. The 119th Meeting of the CMEA Executive Council approved proposals regarding the tasks, powers and duties of the head organisation coordinating work on the problems set by the Comprehensive Programme for Scientific and Technological Progress up to the Year 2000.

The head organisation is responsible for the implementation of the Programme provisions within the time limits set, for the achievement of the scientific and technological results needed and for their application in production. It is also empowered to establish direct relations with the executors of specific work according to this or that theme or assignment and also has a right to sign treaties or contracts. Dynamically developing integrational processes at microlevel require prompt decisions on the location, role and functions of head organisations and cooperating coexecutors in the course of coordinating plans, on relations between them and CMEA agencies and the national planning bodies of individual countries in the

course of drafting international treaties to implement the Comprehensive Programme and reflect in protocols of the results of plan coordination and in foreign trade agreements the accords that have been reached.

To further the integrational cooperation of scientific-production combines, enterprises and other economic entities, it is necessary that the mechanism of planned organisation of cooperation and of its long-term strategic orientation be reinforced. This is an objective need also because the solution of problems of coordinated restructuring and technological reconstruction of the CMEA countries' economies with a view to intensifying them goes beyond the five-year period. The corresponding components have developed to a degree in practice, which has found expression in, among other things, the prolongation of the time limits of some integrational measures included in the plan coordination programme for the current five-year period.

However, long-term coordination of plans and programmes is still limited in scale. A pressing problem today is to work out methodological principles and methodologies for the solution of problems of planned organisation of long-term integrational cooperation, in particular, with due regard to the circumstance that there are considerable distinctions between coordination for a five-year period and coordination for the longer term. Besides, account must be taken of the distinction in the various countries' approaches to long-term management and planning.

Attention in studying the problems of long-term planned coordination should be given above all to coordinating the long-term development of economic sectors which determine scientific and technological progress. The experience gained by several countries suggests that long-term coordination should consist chiefly in agreeing on long-range national programmes for cooperation and in drawing up relevant international programmes on their basis. A detailed elaboration of long-term accords with due regard to intersectoral, intrasectoral and other aspects would be the object of national economic plan coordination for a five-year period. Long-term coordination makes it possible to shape and implement a coordinated structural policy. Emphasis on the long-term approach creates the prerequisites for ending the existing differentiation of cooperation in science, technology, investment and production. A problem closely connected with this is that of extending the temporal framework of agreements on international specialisation and cooperation in production, the drafting of relevant treaties covering a period of 10 to 15 years, which would help make cooperation more lasting and reliable. This approach is particularly relevant in light of the targets set by the Comprehensive Programme, which has long-term, strategic significance.

Carrying collective prognostication and analysis deeper is an important requisite for putting cooperation between the CMEA countries in planning on a conceptual basis. In coordinating national economic plans, about 40 joint forecasts were compiled on the development prospects of diverse spheres of the economy of the socialist community. Altogether the past 10 to 15 years have seen CMEA agencies prepare several hundred long-range estimates of this kind containing varied information on economic, scientific and technological trends in fraternal countries. Analytical research into the long-range character of the trends and patterns of important general economic indicators of development of the CMEA countries is going on continuously; a good deal of forecasting has been done at the sectoral level. Work on substantiating collective prognostication and analysis theoretically and methodically has made some headway.

To strengthen the strategic trend of integrational cooperation, it is essential to impart an appropriate orientation to collective long-range analyses, primarily of the problems of accelerating socio-economic development in step with scientific and technological progress, intensifying production and fostering cooperation between fraternal countries. Macroeconomic projects are particularly important in this respect. Their results could serve as initial guidelines for determining the extent of development of various economic fields and areas of cooperation. However, these

projects are far from being used to the full as yet, with the result that sectoral forecasts fail to take in adequate measure a general economic approach to estimating development prospects.

As far as collective prognostication and analysis are concerned, there is a dividing line between projects relating to science and technology and prospects involving production and the economy at large. The former are geared chiefly to the technological aspects of the matter and give little attention to economic problems of scientific and technological progress. The latter are more comprehensive as we see it; they combine analysis of economic, scientific and technological trends in production with analysis of cooperation. At the same time, these forecasts take a very narrow approach to the problems of the technical reequipment of the economy on the basis of scientific and technological progress. They do not spell out in sufficient measure the problem of the quantities of resources needed for the realisation of the development variants under examination or of ways of using them judiciously, in particular on collective lines. In recent years greater attention has been devoted to these aspects of collective long-range projects. The search for ways of conserving important raw material, fuel and power resources now holds an important place in a number of sectoral forecasts. It is essential to finalise and carry forward this positive trend in collective prognostication and analysis.

In the course of coordinating plans, a change for the better took place in the content of collective projects of this kind. These came to be geared to analysing priority lines of cooperation. Their quality improved as a result of studying the problem of making economic, scientific and technological development more effective, primarily in the sense of rational and thrifty utilisation of diverse resources. The practice of drawing up lists of important forecasts to be discussed at the level of the Bureau of the CMEA Committee on Cooperation in Planning--a practice evolved in recent years--has produced some positive results. To promote this approach to making of forecasts, it is necessary to work out a definite set of forecasts and analyses closely interconnected both in content and in methods and time limits. The chief task, however, is to gear these collective projects to the priority directions of integrational cooperation and to the problem of ensuring their realisation according to plan.

The experience gained in coordinating five-year economic plans has confirmed the enormous advantages of planned organisation of the economy and cooperation between fraternal socialist countries. In this way "socialism has demonstrated its ability to resolve social problems on a fundamentally different basis than previously, namely a collectivist one," to quote the 27th CPSU Congress.

Implementation of the integrational measures planned by the fraternal countries will enable them to use their scientific and production potential more judiciously and effectively as a means of accelerating the pace of socio-economic development and raising the people's living standards.

COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Znaniye", 1986

English Translation COPYRIGHT: Progress Publishers 1986

/9274

CSO: 1812/081

SOCIALIST COMMUNITY AND CEMA AFFAIRS

USE OF CEMA EXPERIENCE IN SERVICE SECTOR EXAMINED

Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 7, 23 Feb 87 pp 20-22

[Article by Nikita Zhovkver]

[Text]

The Potter

It was like magic. Three times in the space of half an hour I watched a potter turn a lump of clay into an elaborate vase. Three times I tried to detect the moment when the shapeless mass began to acquire an elegant form. I failed, although I did not once take my eyes off the spell-binding sight.

"Tell me, Reinhard, do you know what you'll get in advance or do you just trust your instinct?"

"Of course, I know in advance. At first I put the clay through my head. This is the only way if you want to make something better than a chamber pot. If your fingers go wrong, you'd do well to start all over again."

Later that night, in a student club, amid the din and blare of rock music, Reinhard told me about his life, and it struck me that what he had said about pottery applied to much else as well.

Reinhard Kettel is 36. He is a self-employed craftsman, a "private operator" as we would say in Russia. But, unlike in Russia, the corresponding German word does not sound pejorative. On the contrary, self-employed craftsmen are respected and highly esteemed in the G.D.R. The word is never associated with "money grubbing" or "profiteering."

True, a self-employed baker, tailor, shoemaker, watchmaker or car mechanic earn (marginally) more than their counterparts in government employment, but

it would never occur to anyone to describe the difference as "unearned" income. Consider the facts. The self-employed baker gets up at four in the morning so that his neighbour can eat a fresh roll for breakfast before going to a government-owned bakery to make bread for the people. And what's wrong with a stonemason earning good money by building a house in the country for a university professor on his days off? Be that as it may, I emerged from my numerous meetings and talks in the G.D.R. with the impression that people engage in private crafts not so much for material benefit, to make more money, as provide an outlet for their creativity, and to honour tradition. Reinhard Kettel is a case in point, although his story is somewhat unusual.

After secondary school, Reinhard acquired a university degree and worked as a civil engineer in Weimar until 1980. He was doing quite well. His salary was rising (1,500 marks a month) and his chances of promotion were good.

"Eventually, I might have become chief engineer at my building trust," says Reinhard.

"Didn't you like the prospect?"

"I liked it, but my heart was not in the job I was doing."

At 30 Reinhard decided to make a clean break. It took courage. A career is not a piece of clay which you can fashion and refashion endlessly. Reinhard decided to take the risk. In 1980 he gave up his job with the intention

of becoming a potter. It was easier said than done. He had to go through a number of formalities before obtaining a licence to practise a private craft. He had no qualifications. The government bodies had a point: after all, the republic had paid for his training as an engineer.

Reinhard spent two years as an apprentice to a potter and a year attending a special course. He passed both the theoretical and practical tests. In 1983 he was allowed to open his own shop provided he passed a craftsman's test (according to the laws of the G.D.R., only a certified craftsman can extend his business by hiring apprentices and pupils). That meant more studying. He had to go through two stages at the district arts-and-crafts academy. Stage A included managerial sciences and stage B practical training. He had to pay for tuition out of his own pocket, 600 marks for the first and 1,500 marks for the second stage. Not everyone made it. Many failed the intermediate exams. The elegant coffee set Keitel presented before the examining board was highly praised.

"What did you live on all this time? Where did you get the money to pay for your training and buy premises?"

"It certainly cost quite a lot. The premises—an old cowshed and a pigsty three kilometres from Weimar which I converted into a shop—cost me 15,000 marks. It was an uphill struggle, but I had saved a bit when I was working as an engineer."

Guessing that I was doing some mental arithmetic, he explained.

"Every citizen in the G.D.R. can do work on the side in his spare time. If the income from this activity is under 3,000 marks a year, you need the permission neither of the local authorities nor of the enterprise that employs you. This income is not taxed. In my evenings and days off I did some building designs on a private basis."

"How is it possible to check that you earn less or more than three thousand?"

"I fill in a tax form at the end of the year. As for checking, I don't see why anyone should want to. We are not just citizens of our republic. We are the republic and we trust each other. Of course, there are exceptions. But you can always tell who lives beyond his means. Though there are people who hoard."

It was getting dark in Weimar. Reinhard was pushing his little Trabant car to the limit to get me to the shop before dark and show me his front garden, a Japanese-style hill, a courtyard paved with tiles and a fish pond in the process of construction.

"It's very beautiful here in summer. You can breathe and think. I love nature and wildlife. Nature and my craft of pottery have something in common."

The evening chill forced us indoors. The shop consisted of two small rooms containing two potter's wheels, a furnace and buckets of clay. On the shelves were finished and half-finished vases, teapots, jars and figurines.

Reinhard has two apprentices: a 17-year-old girl who has just finished secondary school and a 25-year-old man. After completing their apprenticeship they can go on working for him if they wish. The girl gets a government grant and the apprentice, who has another profession besides, is paid by Reinhard 400 marks a month, according to the law, plus 200 marks (no more) for work done. After finishing their apprenticeship they will make 800 marks. This sum is deducted from the shop's turnover and is exempt from taxation.

"How much do you make after tax?"

"At first I made about seven hundred a month. Now that I have pupils, it's about a thousand."

"But that's about 30 per cent less than in your former job."

"Money is not the main thing for me. It may sound pompous, but to me pottery is an art, a means of self-expression."

Reinhard has no problems selling his wares. A lot of people want to buy them. His products are in demand in arts-and-crafts shops which often buy up wholesale (at a 30 per cent discount) everything he has in his shop. There are also buyers from the F.R.G., where such items are far more expensive.

"Well, now I'll show how to do it," Reinhard kneaded the lump of clay, divided it into three parts and sat down at the wheel. "To begin with, the main thing is to get it right in the centre," he added.

He switched on the motor and we saw the clay mass whirl, gradually transforming into a handsome vase between the potter's fingers.

Services: Private and Government

Is there a connection between a broken tape recorder and a critical attitude to the socialist system? A very close connection, thinks Harold Blume, head of a department with the G.D.R. ministry for local industry, a part of whose duties includes the development of the services sphere.

"If a young lad has to wait a long time to have his favourite toy repaired, he tends to infect the whole social environment with his irritation with the services sphere," says Blume. "And of course labour productivity and attitude to work depend on the services. There are hard statistics to prove that."

That is why the Socialist Unity Party of Germany regards the development of public services as one of the country's priority tasks, socially as well as politically. The 11th Congress of the Party last spring decided to expand the service enterprises and encourage the activity of cooperatives and private businesses. In the current five years their volume will increase by 28 per cent. It is a measure of the role of co-operative and self-employed craftsmen that they now account for two thirds of all repair and other services rendered to the population. There are over 410,000 craftsmen working at 82,000 private enterprises and more than 2,700 craft cooperatives similar to the now forgotten Russian artels.

My conversation with Harold Blume focussed on these two forms of property which coexist with public property in the G.D.R.'s economy.

"We have had private craftsmen since 1945," says Blume. "We proceeded from Lenin's idea of the need for socialism to coexist with the small private businessmen, and followed the recommendations of the Soviet military administration. We did not just tolerate private crafts, we encouraged them, especially in those spheres where they benefited the whole economy. Take bakers, for example. You can't have a bakery in every little village. Even if it could be done, it would be uneconomical. Private bakers save the government money and transportation costs. And, let's face it, the private baker makes better bread, if only because it is always fresh as it doesn't have to be brought from any distance. Or take the private shoemaker. He will not only

satisfy your order quickly and efficiently, but will give you a lot of useful tips, and you can discuss the weather with him like with a good friend. The private craftsman has no gross production targets, the plan that separates the worker from the customer."

Today, Harold Blume, like other ministry officials in the G.D.R., does not question the economic significance of the self-employed craftsman. Yet there was a time when the phenomenon was frowned upon and the number of private craftsmen was shrinking. The idea was that government enterprises could take care of all the daily needs of the people and put the private craftsman out of business. By the mid-1970s it was clear that the public sector could not handle the job, not yet. From February 12, 1976, the G.D.R. government adopted a series of decisions to promote the private sector in order to improve public services. Credits were made available and tax regulations were changed. Those private craftsmen who work alone or only with their families and have no hired workers (the law allows up to ten) now pay a fixed tax and keep all the rest. If a craftsman hires workers, he pays a tax which can be as high as 60 per cent of the turnover. Taxation depends on the number of employees, the public importance of the particular craft and some other factors.

In May 1985 a decree was issued on preferential credit facilities for the modernization and expansion of private crafts shops (along with contributions from the owners).

The new incentives offered by the government gave a fillip to the private sector. In 1983, for the first time since the 1960s, the number of new licences issued to private craft shops exceeded the number of closures. Today the city has almost 5,000 craftsmen operating their own businesses and employing nearly 20,000 workers. Together with the 160 crafts cooperatives, they account for 70 per cent of the services rendered to the townspeople. Every year, private craftsmen in the G.D.R. capital take on more than 750 apprentices, and the figure for the whole country is close to 30,000.

Nearly half of all the private craftsmen in the G.D.R. (42.1 per cent) run their businesses single-handed or with their families; 19.6 per cent have one

hired worker, 18.9 per cent, two or three, 15.6 per cent, 4-8 employees, and 3.8 per cent, 9 or 10.

"The latter category of private craftsmen," says Harold Blume, "naturally have higher incomes, but they are also more heavily taxed. The first two groups enjoy special privileges, assistance from the state and the local authorities.

"Do private craftsmen have difficulty marketing their goods? Who supplies them with raw materials and equipment?"

"We have special supply and sales associations in various fields catering to bakers, shoemakers, stonemasons and so on. For a fee, these associations supply the craftsmen with everything they need. They buy raw materials and equipment from the government and deliver the finished products to the retailer."

"How much can a craftsman afford to pay his workers?"

"The wages in the private sector are roughly the same as in similar government enterprises. The law and the tax system ensure that."

"What about social insurance in the private sector?"

"They are all insured with the G.D.R. Insurance Society, so they are guaranteed sick pay and pensions."

"My final question is, what is their socio-political position in a socialist society?"

"We orient them towards the services sphere. The self-employed craftsman feels himself to be part of socialist society. The same is true of members of the craft cooperative associations that sprang up in the 1950s as a result of the merger of private craft shops."

Harold Blume took me to one such cooperative.

Cooperatives

The craft cooperative Zentrum situated off Friedrichstrasse caters mainly for the inhabitants of the centre of town. It is 28 years old and has 340 members. The cooperative manufactures heaters for export, ignition coils for mopeds, electrical appliances to suit customers' requirements (lift signals,

automatic light switches). It repairs TV sets, vacuum cleaners, razors, washing machines and other household appliances. Its turnover is just under 19 million marks a year.

In addition to the main premises where I spoke to Michael Wegener, a member of the board, the cooperative has 19 outlets in the centre of Berlin.

"We work closely with the government repair association which shares part of orders with us," says Wegener. "A division of labour, so to speak. We repair one type of appliance, and the association another type. To save the customer's time, the reception offices are the same. That is to say, the customer does not have to take a broken coffee grinder and a fan to different shops. He brings them to the same place and gets them back at the same place."

A craft cooperative is a socialist enterprise belonging to the collective category of property. It operates under the local council, which sets the volume of its operations (but not the volume of profits) and levies taxes. It is a progressive tax, as for self-employed craftsmen, amounting to between 10 and 60 per cent of the turnover.

But, unlike the private craftsman, the cooperative has less room for manoeuvre in distributing its income. The wages are set by the government and are comparable with wages in government enterprises. In accordance with the model statutes, only half the profits can be used for the social needs of the collective, for cultural events or paid in bonuses which cannot exceed those paid in government enterprises by more than 30 per cent. The state sees to it that the incomes of the cooperative workers are not much higher than those of government workers. The other part of the profits goes to expand production.

"Who supplies the cooperative with spares and equipment?"

"The economic council of Berlin takes

our orders," says Wegener. "As a rule, all our requests are met. Recently we got a new computer."

A worker entering the cooperative pays entrance dues in instalments, amounting to two months' earnings. If he leaves the cooperative, he gets the money back. Take-home pay at the Zentrum cooperative is between 750 and 950 marks a month. The cooperative is managed by a board elected every two years by secret ballot.

"How much time does it take to have an appliance repaired at the cooperative?"

"We keep to the time limits fixed by the state: 12 days for a washing machine, 10 days for a television set. Usually, we have it ready earlier. If further repairs are needed through our fault, we do them free of charge, with the worker responsible not getting a pfennig."

There is much in the crafts sector and the services in the G.D.R. that is deserving of praise. Some valuable experience has been accumulated. At the same time, as the people I spoke to noted, much remains to be done to improve the services sphere and make it more dynamic and efficient. Upon my arrival in Berlin I unpacked my suitcase to discover a stain on my jacket. After trying without success to remove the spot, I took it to the dry cleaner's in the hotel. The attendant shook her head, "Sorry, we can't deal with it for you in the four days before you leave."

I had no time to take the jacket to a private dry cleaning shop in the centre of Berlin. But I have a hunch that they would have been able to do it for me in time.

Walner- Berlin- Moscow

THIRD WORLD ISSUES

CEMA COOPERATION WITH SOCIALIST-ORIENTED STATES DESCRIBED

Moscow CMEA. ECONOMIC COOPERATION in English No 3, 86 pp 111-114

[Article by Alexander Aleshkin]

[Text]

The planned economies of the countries of the socialist community are a persuasive example of relatively speedy social and economic development. Their experience is therefore of special importance for developing countries that have recently obtained their political independence, which now strive to become economically independent as well. The backwardness of colonialism has to be liquidated, the economic structure has to be reconstructed and economic growth has to be ensured. Planning ahead wherever possible has therefore become their practice.

With the formation of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance a system of economic relations with developing countries, embracing trade, economic and technological cooperation, credit, and training has been established. Cooperation in planning has been made necessary by more extensive cooperation and a mutual interest in its furtherance. This form of cooperation is recognized as a most important factor of strengthening the economy and increasing the forces of production of developing countries.

Experience gained by the CMEA member countries in the coordination of their national economic plans is of special interest for developing states. This was pointed out at the 5th Session of UNCTAD.

To quote the published documents: "The tendency of deepening economic cooperation between developing countries determines the interest expressed by them in the mechanism of coordination of the economic plans of the socialist countries of Eastern Europe within the CMEA, including the coordination of development plans in different sectors of the economy. The experience gained by the CMEA may be useful to developing countries in organizing economic integration."

The forms and methods of cooperation of the CMEA member countries with developing states in planning are jointly attended to and improved in an ongoing manner. A certain contractual legal basis has already been established, containing detailed provisions covering content, forms and priorities. Planners from the CMEA member countries render assistance, both on a bilateral basis and within the framework of the United Nations, to a number of developing states in drafting

their plans for social and economic development.

In the course of years of cooperation the countries accumulated a certain modicum of experience in this field, in particular, in annual and medium-term planning. This cooperation takes place on mutually acceptable terms, in different forms:

- rendering of assistance to developing states, on the basis of their requests, concerning the main trends, plans and programmes of social and economic development by supplying advisers to the planning and other government authorities;

- exchange of experience and knowledge in planning, within bilateral commissions, sub-commissions and working groups established on the basis of agreements;

- organization of the education of foreign specialists in courses by the central planning authorities and relevant higher educational institutions of the CMEA member countries.

of the economic effects of basic project envisaged for construction in the given country.

In planning the Soviet Union acted as a pioneer in passing on experience to developing countries. Following requests by a number of governments in Asia and Africa teams of Soviet advisers were sent to these countries in order to convey to them the fruit of experience accumulated in the Soviet Union concerning planning and scientific research, as well as the drafting of plans for social and economic development.

In the middle 50s Soviet advisers in India helped with the Second Five Year Plan in India for 1955-59. In the 60s-80s Soviet advisers assisted in planning the economies of Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Ethiopia, Ghana, Iraq, People's Republic of Korea, Uganda and other developing countries. The First Five Year Plan of Afghanistan (1956-1961), the First Development Plan for Algeria (1970-1973) the First Development Plan (1976-1980) and the Second (1981-1985) Five Year Plan of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen were prepared in that manner. Soviet advisers rendered assistance in developing the main trends of social and economic development of Angola (1982-1992), Mozambique (1981-1990), Iraq (1975-1995), Sao Tome and Principe (1982-1985), Ethiopia (1981-1992) and others.

Cooperation in sectoral and territorial planning and programming has grown as well. Soviet advisers and the relevant national organizations devised general development schemes for the crude oil and gas industry of Algeria, Libya, and Syria, for the power grid of Libya, for the utilization of water resources in the river basins of Mozambique, Syria, Ethiopia, comprehensive development schemes for agriculture and fisheries and for geological exploration in the People's Democratic Repub-

Rendering of assistance

The CMEA member countries, when rendering assistance to developing countries in planning consider that the development of particular sectors of the economy requires a comprehensive approach.

The economic needs of states, the siting of new production capacities, supply with fuel, raw materials, electric power, transport and the sequence of the establishment of new enterprises etc. are determined on that basis.

Economists of the socialist community participate in the study and improvement of activities in the developing states and devote special attention to the analysis of the data and development of the necessary information basis. In addition, lectures are prepared with their assistance, on the evaluation

lic of Yemen. The results were taken into consideration during the preparation of plans for economic development.

At present, in the planning activity, the Soviet Union is cooperating with 25 developing countries as well as numerous international agencies of the United Nations, including the ECE, ESCAP, UNIDO, UNCTAD, ECA and others. Cooperation has grown more active in Afghanistan, Algeria, Ethiopia, India, Nicaragua and the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen.

Other CMEA member countries also render assistance to developing countries on a bilateral basis, e.g.

Bulgaria cooperates with Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, the People's Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, India, Iran, Iraq, Libya, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Syria, Tanzania, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen;

Republic of Cuba with Angola, the People's Republic of the Congo, Cape Verde, Ethiopia, Ghana, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Sao Tome and Principe, Tanzania, Zambia, Zimbabwe;

Czechoslovakia with Algeria, Ethiopia, India, Iraq, Syria, Turkey;

the GDR with Angola, Algeria, the People's Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, India, Iraq, Mexico, Mozambique, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen;

Hungary with Angola, Argentina, Brazil, Ethiopia, Egypt, Ghana, India, Iran, Iraq, Peru, Tanzania, Uganda, Venezuela;

Mongolia and Vietnam with Kampuchea and Laos;

Poland with Algeria, India, Iraq, Laos, Nicaragua, Syria.

Cooperation in planning is also widening between developing countries and Romania.

Exchange of experience

A transfer of experience in planning also takes place on the basis of multi-lateral cooperation between the CMEA member countries and developing states. Thus the Soviet Union and Hungary participated in preparing the Second Five Year Plan of Uganda (1966-1971) and of Tanzania (1969-1973). Soviet advisers rendered assistance in developing the current and future plans for the development of Angola (together with advisers from Bulgaria, the GDR, and the Republic of Cuba), of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, of Mozambique (together with the GDR) of Ethiopia (jointly with the GDR and the Republic of Cuba).

Cooperation has most effectively grown as the result of establishing direct contacts between the planning authorities of the socialist and of developing states. At present, the State Planning Board of the Soviet Union has agreements on cooperation with the planning authorities of Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Iraq, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Sao Tome and Principe, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen.

The Central Council for Planning of the Republic of Cuba cooperates with the planning authorities of Angola, Cape Verde, Ethiopia, Ghana, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Sao Tome and Principe. Similar agreements were concluded between the planning authorities of the GDR on the one hand and of Algeria, Angola, Ethiopia, India, Mexico, Mozambique, Syria, Tanzania on the other, as well as between Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Bulgaria and the corresponding organizations etc.

The agreements on cooperation between the central planning bodies of the partner countries envisage the establishment, within the framework of mixed commissions for economic, scientific and technological cooperation, of special groups for planning, as well as measures for the partial coordination of national economic plans. These representatives of central planning bodies of the CMEA and of the developing countries study questions of economic planning and work out the methodology of planning.

Cooperation in planning of the CMEA member countries with India, the largest developing state, has been successful. In 1979 a Long-term Development Programme for Scientific, Technological and Economic Cooperation was established jointly with the Soviet Union for 10-15 years. Its realization, according to the UNCTAD-5 Cooperation in Planning document leads to significant growth in mutual trade and will, in particular, contribute to the growth of exports of finished goods from India both to the Soviet Union and to third countries. Similar bilateral agreements on cooperation in planning were concluded between India and Czechoslovakia (1974), Hungary (1978), the GDR (1979) and Bulgaria (1980).

Training

Cooperation in planning also envisages the training of staff for developing states in CMEA member countries. It takes place either in the course of joint work on national planning or by training men and women from the developing countries at university and colleges in the countries of the socialist community. In addition, various courses of postgraduate training are available at the State Planning Board of the Soviet Union, the Business School in Berlin,

Further Training Planning Courses in Poland, the Management College and the Institution for Physical Planning within the Central Council for Planning of the Republic of Cuba, and the Educational Centre for the Postgraduate Training of Key Staff within the State Planning Board of Bulgaria. They provide the chance to acquire knowledge of the methods and organizational principles of socialist planning.

International platforms, in particular those held on the initiatives of the United Nations and its specialized agencies with the participation of the Secretariat of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance play an important role in training staff from developing states in planning and in their postgraduate training. While the CMEA Secretariat participated in the activity of only five platforms in 1981, by 1985 this number grew to 18 seminars, 16 of which were held in Moscow, including a seminar on the methodology and technologies of planning energetics (according to the programme of the ESCAP) and a course on the planning of housing in conformity with the programme of the ECA.

Strengthening of mutual relations

The system of multilateral cooperation between developing countries of a socialist orientation and the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance has grown apace. In recent years representatives of the People's Republic of Angola, the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, the People's Republic of Mozambique and of Socialist Ethiopia regularly participate in the work of CMEA Sessions as observers. Since the 37th meeting of the CMEA Session (1983) a delegation of

the Republic of Nicaragua has also taken part in it. These contacts enable them to determine the spheres of cooperation with CMEA member countries, allowing them to familiarize themselves with the mechanism of multilateral relations within CMEA.

One of the new forms of cooperation is participation in the work of the CMEA Committee for Cooperation in Planning, as observers. That is how the representatives of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen were provided the possibility of direct participation in the coordination of assistance to be granted for that country on a multilateral basis.

National economic planning takes place on almost all developing states. In over 100 countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America plans are implemented. Although the nature of the plans and the methodology of their preparation differs, they promote the development of the state sector and social and economic change in those countries.

At the Summit Economic Conference of the CMEA member countries the countries of the socialist community

confirmed their readiness to further extend cooperation with developing countries, starting from the fact that this will promote the improvement of their national economies and the strengthening of the economic independence of these states, as well as the development of mutually beneficiary economic relations with them. In this respect the intensification of the activity of rendering them assistance in the planned development of their national economies is given special significance. As was mentioned at the 27th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Soviet Union will continue the systematic implementation of coordinated long-term programmes for commercial, economic, scientific and technical relations with these countries.

Joint efforts of the CMEA member countries and of developing states play an important role in coping with the ongoing business of international life. The strengthening of multilateral economic relations would contribute to the successful reconstruction of international economic relations on a fair and democratic basis.

COPYRIGHT: All Rights Reserved by CMEA Secretariat

/9317
CSO: 1812/62

THIRD WORLD ISSUES

ISLAMIC CONFERENCE ORGANIZATION MEETING ASSESSED

Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 6, 16 Feb 87 p 9

[Article by Leonid Medvedko]

[Text]

ALTHOUGH DESCRIBED AS "ROUTINE," THE FIFTH CONFERENCE OF THE HEADS OF STATE AND GOVERNMENT OF THE ORGANIZATION OF ISLAMIC CONFERENCE MEMBER STATES, HELD IN KUWAIT LATE IN JANUARY, PROCEEDED IN WHAT CAN BE CHARACTERIZED AS AN EXTRAORDINARY SITUATION.

Sheikh Jaber al-Sabah, Emir of Kuwait, said at the opening ceremony that since imperialism and Zionism had started encroaching on Arab lands, the Moslem world had constantly encountered violence and aggression. Millions of people professing Islam felt the searing pain of regional and local conflagrations, still unextinguished or just sparked off in various parts of the Islamic world. The fate of the world at large is also near to Moslem hearts. Even those who have never seen winter realize what the threat of "nuclear winter" is.

The Organization of Islamic Conference was established at a meeting of the leaders of the Moslem countries in Rabat in 1969 shortly after the Israeli Zionists tried

to burn one of the chief Moslem sanctuaries—the Al-Aqsa mosque in Jerusalem. All the top-level forums that followed were convened in periods when the situation had become aggravated. The second conference met in Lahore in 1974, soon after the end of the October 1973 war in the Middle East. The participants in the third conference in Mecca in 1981 concentrated on the situation in the Gulf zone in connection with the outbreak of the Iran-Iraq war. The fourth conference (Casablanca, 1984) discussed the critical situation in Lebanon caused by the American-Israeli-NATO intervention.

This time, the situation became critical in several parts of the Moslem world at once—in the Middle East and northern and central Africa. The Zionists' attempt to blow up another sanctuary—the mosque in El-Khalil in the West Bank Jordan—was taken by the conference as an insult to the entire Moslem world. The continued ostentatious concentration of U.S. naval power in the Eastern Mediterranean and the Persian Gulf is of a still more defiant nature. The echo of war reach-

ed Kuwait, as well: the oil fields on Kuwait's Faylakah Island were shelled, and two shattering explosions thundered in the capital itself. Participants in the forum were threatened by anonymous extremists. This made it necessary to take tight security precautions.

The statements made at the conference and the final documents it adopted mirrored the concern of over 40 states about the exacerbation of world tension in general and the explosive situation in the traditional domain of Islam. Many speakers pointed to the need to cement Moslem solidarity under the circumstances. The final declaration described the Kuwait forum as a "Moslem solidarity conference."

The conference condemned U.S.-Israeli strategic cooperation and urged "effective measures to counter the threat emanating from this alliance."

The forum supported the idea of convening an international conference on the Middle East with the attendance of permanent members of the U.N. Security Council and all the interested parties, includ-

ing the PLO, the only lawful representative of the Palestinian people.

The forum reaffirmed the demand that the Israeli troops be completely withdrawn from all the occupied Arab territories and that the Palestinian people's right to self-determination be recognized. It condemned the intrigues against Lebanon, the U.S. aggression against Libya, and the hostile campaign against Syria and other Moslem countries.

The participants in the Kuwait forum condemned state terrorism and rejected attempts to identify terrorism with the lawful liberation struggle of the peoples against all forms of colonialism and racism.

The Iran-Iraq conflict was high on the conference's agenda, but no key to its settlement was found. The participants called on Iran and Iraq to conclude an armistice and start moving towards a political settlement. Judging from the latest communiqués from the Iran-Iraq front, however, this call fell on deaf

ears. Teheran boycotted the conference altogether because of the presence of Baghdad representatives at it.

The forum welcomed efforts to achieve a political settlement in Afghanistan. However, it did not make its own contribution towards this settlement. This was largely due to the earlier decision—still in force—to suspend Afghanistan's membership of the Organization of Islamic Conference. The decision was adopted several years ago under pressure from the very forces that oppose a peaceful settlement.

Almost all speakers ended their addresses with the traditional Moslem greeting "As-Salamu Aleikum" (Peace be with you). Never in the history of Islam has it had greater political significance or expressed more ardent aspirations than now, when the future of the planet is at stake.

/9317
CSO: 1812/66

THIRD WORLD ISSUES

WORLD ECONOMISTS' CONGRESS ON PROBLEMS IN AGRICULTURAL SECTOR

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Jan 87 p 4

[Article by Academician O. Bogomolov, member of the executive committee of the International Economic Association, under the rubric "Global Problems": "For the Good of People"; first two paragraphs are source introduction]

[Text] Among numerous international forums, the recent Eighth World Congress of Economists had the most direct bearing on people's well-being. It was convened by the International Economic Association (IEA) in the Indian capital of Delhi. The topic was "The Balance Between Industry and Agriculture in Economic Development." More than 1,000 scholars from various countries, including the Soviet Union, took part.

The congress took place soon after the conclusion of the visit by M. S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to India. The unity of the Soviet and Indian leaders' approaches to the fundamental problems of ensuring peace and eliminating the threat of nuclear conflict, and to the other global problems of the present day, and their desire to intensify good-neighborly relations, including relations in the economic sphere, created a favorable atmosphere for holding the congress.

Factory and Field

In our days notions of socioeconomic progress, the strengthening of national economic power and the growth of the people's well-being are usually associated with a high level of industrialization and with the high-technology branches. Indeed, one can hardly find an example in which a country, relying mainly on its agriculture and the processing of agricultural products, has been able to achieve such a high per capita level of national income as the industrially developed countries of the West have today.

Although even agriculture has not remained entirely outside the changes brought about by scientific and technological progress, it nonetheless falls into the group of "old" branches of the economy, the proportional share of which is declining. But, as noted at the congress, this does not mean it has lost its exceptionally important role in the life of society.

Until the present time half of the globe's population has lived on income from agriculture, and in the developing states this share is substantially higher. Providing the planet's population with food, and industry with agricultural raw materials has become one of the acute global problems of the present day, the solution of which requires an international coordination of efforts.

In comparison to industry, the agrarian sector of the economy almost universally possesses appreciably less dynamism and is more conservative in its structures. In most cases it is distinguished by a lower level of labor productivity and concentration of production, and by a lower return per unit of capital investments. Such consequences of industrial progress as environmental pollution and reduction of the area of agricultural lands make it more difficult to increase food production. To this one must add the considerable dependence of agriculture on weather conditions and the instability of the market for its products. In the opinion of a number of congress participants, these reasons explain the fact that in many developing states, as well as some socialist countries, the agrarian sector is a bottleneck in the economy, and in the industrially developed countries of the West, a high level of agrarian production is based to a considerable extent on huge state subsidies. In recent decades the average annual rates of growth of food production in the world have only slightly exceeded population growth. Famine and hunger among hundreds of millions of people in some parts of the globe are combined today with the "overproduction" of food in others of its regions.

The discussions at the congress showed that characteristic features of the relationship between agriculture and industry are, at the initial stages of industrial development, the transfer of some accumulations and manpower from the agrarian sector to other sectors of the economy and, at later industrial stages, the state subsidizing of agriculture. All extremes and "excesses" in these matters may have severe negative consequences.

The specific features of agriculture make the creation of incentives for production, the raising of its productivity and the use of modern machinery and technologies frequently a more complicated matter than in other branches. In this connection, some speakers pointed out a number of circumstances. In particular, they pointed to the existence in many of the world's countries, in addition to a modern agricultural sector working for the market, of an extensive traditional sector oriented toward self-sufficiency. As a result of its fragmented nature and backwardness, this latter sector possesses greater inertness when it comes to social and technical transformations. Progress in agrarian production can also be impeded by the system of land ownership and a low cultural and educational level among farmers, their lack of adequate information about the accomplishments of modern agricultural technology, and their unwillingness to undertake the risk of using it. A lack or shortage of funds for investments also stand in the way of progress.

Timely Formulas

It followed from the discussions that the achievement of an optimum in the development of agriculture and industry presupposes the employment of such measures of agrarian policy as land reform, the encouragement of the

cooperative movement in the most diverse forms, the establishment of state livestock sections, a thoughtful and flexible tax policy, the implementation of government programs of irrigation and land reclamation, the combatting of erosion, and the encouragement of the development of enterprises that process agricultural output, as well as those that supply it with machinery, fertilizer and various chemicals.

As the congress's work showed, initial notions about the relationship between the agrarian and industrial sectors are changing in our times, for a process is under way whereby they are being integrated and national agroindustrial complexes are being formed. It is characteristic in this connection that agricultural technology itself is increasingly acquiring the traits of industrial technology. The production of agricultural output is being combined with its processing and marketing and supplemented by other types of activity: industrial, transport, construction, and repair and maintenance. This provides employment for the released rural population and increases the income of enterprises.

The congress participants showed great interest in the socialist countries' experience. The reports by Soviet scholars noted that in our country the preponderance of agricultural output is produced in the social socialist sector. In the past year our agriculture's gross output rose by a factor of 2.9 in comparison to the prewar year of 1940, whereas labor productivity (in social production) in that branch rose by a factor of 4.9. This process, however, still has not kept up with the rapidly growing needs of the Soviet economy. Therefore, the task of speeding up agrarian development and increasing its effectiveness is especially urgent. In 1986-1990, it is planned to more than double the increase in agricultural production over that of the previous five-year period.

As speakers from Hungary, the GDR, Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria reported, the successfully developing socialist agriculture of those countries is making a great contribution to their overall economic growth and imparting stability to their entire economies. Czechoslovakia, for example, has for the most part already achieved self-sufficiency in the most important types of foodstuffs, the GDR has substantially reduced its grain imports, and Hungary has turned into a major exporter of agricultural products.

China's experience was also illuminated. As a result of the abandonment of administrative methods of management and the shift to economic ones, and the introduction of measures to give peasants a real economic interest, it has been possible in less than 10 years in that country, to increase labor productivity and production volumes with a base of agricultural equipment that has remained practically unchanged.

In resolving the question of the correlation between agriculture and industry, many countries proceed from the concept of the need for self-sufficiency in the basic types of foodstuffs. As the discussion showed, such policy still does not rule out, and is frequently combined with, a desire to expand exports of agricultural products. This allows the developing countries to pay for imports of equipment and many other goods necessary for stable economic growth.

Disarmanent and Development

However, in the opinion of many specialists, world trade in agricultural products is presently undergoing a dangerous crisis. Its manifestation is huge surpluses of agricultural products and very low world prices for them, which have been caused to a significant extent by overproduction and export subsidies in the industrially developed capitalist countries, as well as by increasing protectionism.

All this hits the developing countries especially hard. In real terms, prices for their export products dropped by more than 30 percent over the 1980-1985 period, whereas the drop was only 12 percent for U.S. farmers, and prices remained practically at the same level in the European Economic Community (EEC).

The losses of the developing countries that are exporters of agricultural products have potentially grave consequences for industrialization and make their indebtedness even more acute. The problem of the balance between the two sectors of the economy is thereby assuming an important global aspect.

In this connection, Soviet participants in the congress explained the USSR's attitude toward the growing threat of the derangement of the world economy that is facing the world community. Our country has been the initiator of specific steps to reduce military arsenals, which would not only deflect the threat of war but remove the tremendous burden of nonproductive expenses from humanity and make it possible to give the developing countries effective assistance in overcoming their economic lag.

Many representatives of Western economic thought characteristically exhibited a desire to circumvent the acute social aspects of the topic and substitute abstract theorizing in the spirit of bourgeois neoclassical concepts for a concrete analysis of processes. However, real problems nonetheless occupied the center of the congress participants' attention. For all the differences in the viewpoints expressed, the world forum of economists unquestionably contributed to a better understanding of the problems connected with providing all inhabitants of our planet with adequate food and agricultural raw materials.

8756
CSO: 1807/147

GENERAL ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

REPLY TO FRG CRITICISM OF JOINT VENTURES

Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 6, 16 Feb 87 p 16

[Article by Genrikh Bazhenov, cand. sc. (econ)]

[Text]

The Soviet government's decision to set up joint enterprises with capitalist partners has provoked a stormy and controversial reaction in the West. It has been suggested that the move "amounts to the most important major change of doing business in the Soviet Union in the last century... and a major development in the economy of the world."

Some people share your opinion that joint ventures are incompatible with the Soviet economic system. Others doubt that joint ventures will succeed because the interests involved are opposed: the Soviet Union views them as an extra source of currency earnings and a means of gaining access to Western technology, while most Western firms do not want to see more competitive goods entering the world market and regard joint ventures as simply a chance to break into the vast Soviet market.

One could cite many other comments. Like any new departure, this form of East-West business cooperation has its adherents, its opponents, and its doubting Thomases. Only time will tell who is right. Even so, the fact that joint enterprise is being encouraged indicates the intention to abandon old attitudes to foreign economic activity. It indicates a desire to give scope for business initiative and enterprise.

Of course, there may be setbacks and snags along the way. Experience shows that some economic managers are still inclined to tackle new problems using old and inadequate methods. Some-

times they cannot or do not want to exercise the greater discretionary powers they have been given. This lends particular importance to the competence of the staff who will work at joint enterprises. The main thing is to prevent the new idea being discredited by incompetence.

As for safeguards against "commands from the top," the recently published ruling of the Council of Ministers on the procedure for creating and operating joint enterprises in Soviet territory contains such guarantees, within the framework of Soviet law, of course. The safeguards cover property rights, export and reinvestment of profits and tax rebates. The board of a joint enterprise will itself plan its commercial activity and the volume of sales in the Soviet and foreign markets, and determine its scientific and technological policy.

The same cannot be said of the safeguards referred to by comrade Martynov in his letter published in New Times issue No. 5. The Soviet Union cannot guarantee that foreign governments will not set obstacles in the way of joint ventures. Nor can it guarantee that, to quote comrade Martynov, "politics should not rudely intervene in economic affairs." It has to be borne in mind, however, that the intergovernmental agreements on economic, scientific and technical cooperation which the Soviet Union has signed with many West European countries provide for the extension of nontraditional areas of co-operation, including joint ventures.

Many capitalist companies had committed themselves to opening joint enterprises before the government decree was published. Dozens of other firms are negotiating agreements. Recently an agreement was signed to set up a joint enterprise with Finnair. It will be one of some 20 Soviet-Finnish joint ventures.

The outlook for Soviet U.S. joint enterprises is less promising. Given the present U.S. restrictions on exports to the U.S.S.R.—in the absence of most-favoured-nation treatment—American companies will find it much more difficult to set up joint venture firms with us than their West European and Japanese competitors. American businessmen believe the success of the joint venture programme will ultimately depend on the readiness of the U.S. government to allow high technology exports to the U.S.S.R. Threats of disruption may arise if the Pentagon bans the supplies of components and materials, as has often been the case.

Washington's "anti-guarantees" are not confined to the economic sphere. They also apply to problems that have nothing to do with commerce. The Providence Journal published in America writes that "if American cooperation with the Soviet regime on operation of industrial plants has any point beyond bare profits then maybe U.S. firms could have some impact on the way the Soviet

Union treats political dissenters."

Of course, the Soviet Union will not make any political concessions to Western firms. Both sides should proceed from business considerations and seek to balance mutual interests and benefits.

What impact will joint ventures have on Soviet industry? It must be made clear that the current economic reform in this country will ensure higher productivity, quality and efficiency without the assistance of Western firms. Our main reserve here is the abandonment of the practice of levelling, of a "wage ceiling" for skilled workers. A letter to the editor raises fears that there may be a drift away of skilled labour to joint enterprises. I do not share these fears. Up to now we have been speaking of "pilot plants," and the number of vacancies over the next few years will not be commensurate with the number of jobs in our economy as a whole.

But these "pilot plants" will offer the Soviet customer new goods that are up to world standards. Competition will make similar Soviet enterprises try to keep up with their level of quality and productivity. These economic "commands from the bottom" are an important function of joint ventures.

/9274
CSO: 1812/067

GENERAL ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

INTEROFIS CHIEF DISCUSSES PURPOSE, FACILITIES

Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 8, 1-8 Mar 87 p 6

[Article by Yekaterina Bulychova]

[Text] The World Trade Centre (WTC), which belongs to the USSR Chamber of Commerce and Industry, is located on the Krasnopresnenskaya Embankment in Moscow. Five specialized Soviet firms at the WTC try to satisfy the many and sundry needs of foreign companies and their Soviet partners. One of these Soviet firms helps arrange the tourist aspect of the foreign guests' programme in the USSR and another organizes all sorts of international forums held at the WTC. A third helps foreign firms not yet accredited in the USSR to do business in our country. A fourth provides various information to all who request it. A fifth supplies foreign clients with necessary goods. A sixth is called Interofis and is directed by Anatoly Neprin, who talks to our correspondent.

CAN YOU tell me, please, about Interofis?

We help clients find accommodations at the hotel complex, help them rent apartments, administrative and auxiliary premises. All our work - booking hotel rooms, processing and filing applications, keeping track of confirmations and cancellations - is done with the help of an automatic management system. We also do interior decorating, engaging offices of foreign firms accredited with the WTC and also some foreign companies as subcontractors. With their help our firm has equipped 80 administrative premises and 56 apartments. In the future we expect to expand this service using our own people and resources.

How many hotel facilities are at your disposal?

A 20-storey office building with 20,000 sq m of floor space, the Mezhdunarodnaya-I Hotel (524 rooms) and Mezhdunarodnaya-II (550 apartments) on the WTC territory. In addition, we have two Soyuz hotels located in different parts of Moscow. These hotels annually accommodate up to 30,000 guests - mainly businessmen, scientists and engi-

neers who come to attend conferences held here. They also travel here because of their work with the Ministry of Foreign Trade, and the State Committee for Science and Technology affairs. Our firm has agreements with 40 foreign travel firms and bureaus to ensure better services for the Centre's guests.

How many representatives of foreign firms are there today at the WTC?

People from 72 foreign firms accredited in the USSR and also banks and other organizations from 19 countries of the world are now accommodated in the administrative building. The US Occidental Petroleum corporation was the first to sign a contract with Sovincentre. Later on it was followed by Banco di Napoli, Societe General, the Lloyds Bank, Olivetti, Swissair, Sumitomo Corp and other well-known firms and banks.

Over 160 foreign families are now living at the Mezhdunarodnaya-II Hotel. As a rule, in offering apartments, preference is given to firms accredited in the USSR. But the Centre now has partners not accredited in our

count, end of last year, Interofis signed contracts for letting 410 apartments, including 141 for agents of non-accredited firms.

Do you encounter problems in your work?

Our staff has its stressful days, especially when major international congresses and exhibitions are held in Moscow. At such times, due to the lack of hotel facilities at the Trade Centre, we do find ourselves a little overwhelmed trying to accommodate and provide services for all the foreign guests. The question of building the second phase of the WTC on its territory is now being considered. It's possible that foreign firms would take part in building it.

/9317

CSO: 1812/80

GENERAL ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

REVIEW OF V/O EXPORTLES' 60 YEARS OF OPERATIONS

Moscow SUPPLEMENT TO MOSCOW NEWS in English No 5, Feb 87 p 8

[Text]

In October 1986, one of the Soviet Union's largest foreign trade organizations - V/O EXPORTLES - celebrated the 60th anniversary of its activity.

The Soviet Union's timber trade was launched in 1921 when the first shipment of timber sailed from Arkhangelsk for Great Yarmouth in England. At present, V/O EXPORTLES has established commercial relations with about 500 companies and agencies of 70 countries.

In addition to traditional deliveries of softwood sawngoods, industrial roundwood and plywood, prominent in the exports have become numerous kinds of pulp-and-paper products, particle-board and fibre-board, technological chips, prefabricated wooden houses, etc.

Nearly 60 per cent of the export deliveries of wood and pulp-and-paper goods from the Soviet Union go to the socialist countries. Among the Association's stable partners in international trade are also companies from industrially devel-

oped capitalist nations - Japan, Great Britain, the FRG, Italy, Finland, France, Sweden and others. The share of Soviet timber in the total imports of the major West European countries amounts to 10-20 per cent.

At present, the Association incorporates 5 specialized firms with their own respective ranges of goods: PILOLESEXPORT, EXPORTDREV, PLITIMPEX, CELLOLOZAIMPEX, BUMIMPEX.

The Association is also a major stockholder of 5 joint-stock companies outside the USSR, dealing in exports and imports of timber and pulp-and-paper products: in Britain - Russian Wood Agency (London), in France - Rusbois (Paris), in the FRG - Russholz (Cologne), in Italy - Russlegno (Rome), in Spain - Maderas Rusas (Madrid).

V/O EXPORTLES also operates 8 branch offices within the USSR: Arkhangelsk Office (Arkhangelsk), Leningrad Office (Leningrad), Karelian Office (Petrozavodsk), Baltic Office (Riga), Ukrainian Office

(Uzhgorod), Novorossiisk Office (Novorossiisk), Far Eastern Office (Khabarovsk) and Sakhalin Office (Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk).

By its turnover, V/O EXPORTLES is nowadays the world's largest supplier of timber and pulp-and-paper products.

Altogether, over the 60 years of its existence the Association has exported about 280 million cubic metres of sawn timber, 400 million cu m of industrial roundwood (of which 130 million cu m went to Japan), 9 million cu m of plywood, 14 million tonnes of paper pulp, 17 million tonnes of paper and board. V/O EXPORTLES concludes annually over 3,000 contracts for export and import deliveries, totalling 2,500 million roubles.

V/O EXPORTLES also imports considerable quantities of wood and paper goods, notably of pulp-and-paper products: newsprint, printing and writing paper, cardboard, paper bags, cardboard boxes, parchment, viscose pulp, wall-paper, cork materials

and articles, some kinds of plywood, etc. Most of the Association's imports originate in Finland, Sweden and Norway, as well as in the socialist countries in Europe. However, export transactions have remained the prevailing essence of V/O EXPORTLES's activities.

V/O EXPORTLES was one of the first in the Soviet foreign trade system to apply new patterns of economic partnership with companies and agencies from abroad on the compensation basis to wood and paper trade. This barter trade flourished not only in the Far East of the country, but in the Western regions

as well, in the domain of the timber, wood-working, pulp-and-paper industries. Thus, crowned with successful execution was the agreement with Perusjuhtuma, Finland, on construction of Pyaozer Forestry and Timber Project in the Karelian ASSR, for which the payments were in the form of deliveries of wood from the USSR. V/O EXPORTLES took part in the major multilateral agreement on construction of the giant wood-chemical enterprise - the Ust-Ilimsk Timber Industry Complex - in a joint venture with organizations from a number of socialist countries - the

CMEA member-states, and France. A substantial part of the construction costs is paid for by deliveries of bleached softwood sulphate pulp produced by Ust-Ilimsk and Bratsk combines.

In 1981, V/O EXPORTLES was awarded the Gold Mercury International Prize for its contribution to extension of international economic partnership and trade among nations.

Please, address your orders and enquiries to V/O EXPORTLES 19, Trubnikovski Per. 121803 GSP, Moscow G-69, USSR. Cables: EXPORTLES MOSCOW G-69. Telex: 411229 ELES SU

PHOTO CAPTIONS

1. High-quality birch plywood being loaded for shipment.
2. The shipment of craftliner from the wharf of the Arkhangelsk pulp-and-paper mill.
3. Sawn timber being loaded for shipment from the Novorossiisk timber port.
4. V/O EXPORTLES director-general Veniamin Korolev.
5. Pulpwood loading at the Maimaksansky timber port.
6. Production of pulp for export at the Kotlas pulp-and-paper combine.

/9317
CSO: 1812/088

GENERAL ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

REVIEW OF BOOK ON LEGAL ASPECT OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC RELATIONS

Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS in English No 11, Nov 86 pp 134-136

[Ivan Rozhko review of book by H. Mironov]

[Text]

The internationalisation of world economic activities has long been an important factor conditioning many aspects of international relations. This explains why both economists and lawyers show interest in analysis of the system of international sectoral cooperation. Mironov treats the subject from the legal point of view. The book deals with legal aspects of the international cooperation of USSR ministries, departments, the organs of management under their authority and enterprises themselves.

While acknowledging certain distinctions between individual socialist countries in regard to economic mechanisms, the author points at the same time to the similarity of organisational forms, due primarily to the common socio-economic basis on which these mechanisms are functioning. "...A decisive trend in the formation and modernisation of national systems of managing foreign economic, scientific and technological activities in virtually all socialist community countries today", the book stresses, "is the trend towards increasing participation of not only sectoral ministries and departments but other agencies of the production sphere in this process". (p. 19) Expanding foreign relations in the context of international socialist integration provide, as practice has shown, the prerequisites for all-round economic cooperation, including specialisation and cooperation in production, and for the formation of a rational economic structure raising the efficiency of the national economy of every socialist country.

The reader's attention will be attracted by the pages in particular dealing with the principles, forms and interrelation of the regulation of sectoral cooperation between the Soviet Union and other countries in terms of international and civil law. The author spells out in detail the role of economic legislation in the mechanism regulating the international sectoral ties of ministries and government departments and of agencies and enterprises controlled by them. The author's examination of the legal content of international interdepartmental contracts (agreements), which constitute "one of the most important legal instruments of perfecting the entire complex mechanism of the CMEA countries' economic interaction" (p. 69), is interesting both theoretically and practically.

The book gives considerable space to forms of international sectoral cooperation from the standpoint of civil law (economic law). He lists among these forms participation in sales and purchases (export and import operations) under orders (contracts) for the delivery of articles for export purchase and sales treaties (foreign trade contracts), orders for imports, commission treaties involving imports, the provision of various technical and other services by way of rendering economic and technological assistance to foreign countries in the construction of industrial and other projects abroad (deliveries of complete plant, plant assembly, designing, geological prospecting, and so on) with a contract as its legal form. (pp. 80-81).

There is a chapter on legal regulation of the foreign relations of Soviet ministries and government departments. It devotes special attention to the role of sectoral Union ministries in international economic, scientific and technological cooperation and contains a detailed description of their jurisdiction in foreign economic relations. We believe there is reason to fully support the author's proposal to adopt special general (standard) regulations for USSR sectoral economic ministries and state committees reflecting the sphere of action and peculiarities of the sectoral jurisdiction of these bodies, including their functions in maintaining economic, scientific and technological relations with other countries. (p. 119).

The book examines the procedure of international cooperation between Soviet economic management bodies at the level of subvestors (the middle echelon of sectoral economic management)—chief departments and departments of USSR ministries and other agencies, all-Union industrial associations and Zagranposlava associations—and the corresponding management bodies and organisations of CMEA countries. The author attempts to comprehensively investigate the general legal norms of Soviet legislation defining the jurisdiction of Soviet economic organisations and enterprises in the sphere of foreign relations.

Besides production and research and production associations economic, scientific and technological cooperation between the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries involves autonomous enterprises, institutes, designers' offices and other entities outside production (research and production) associations. The role of all these primary echelons of diverse economic fields in foreign trade is steadily growing.

The author describes many aspects of direct sectoral ties between the Soviet Union

and other CMEA countries at the level of ministries, head departments, departments, industrial associations and enterprises. He also examines in detail the legal content of joint economic organisations (firms) set up by participants (founders) from various socialist countries and operating on Soviet territory.

However, the book is not free of shortcomings and debatable propositions. To begin with, the author expresses certain opinions in a categorical form without backing them up with adequate arguments. The right of operative property, for example, is not as indisputable as the author seems to believe (p. 102). Soviet legal theory makes a strict distinction between the concepts of the "right of property" and the "right of operative management of property". The introduction of the concept of the "right of operative property" into scientific terminology may lead in the theoretical sphere to misinterpreting and confusing the two legal categories.

The author ought to have reflected more fully the characteristics of both the "purely" civil-law relations and the broader, public-law forms of legal relations involved in the international economic activities of sectoral ministries, departments and their agencies. But he confines himself to a general presentation of the problem without disclosing its content, although today it is particularly important to international economic cooperation, above all between enterprises and organisations of CMEA countries. Also, the author should apparently have given much greater attention to the diverse forms of foreign economic ties maintained by the head departments and departments of Soviet sectoral ministries and other government agencies as well as by all Union industrial associations.

The problems treated in the book are most relevant, and this lends it special scientific and practical value.

COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Znaniye", 1986

English translation COPYRIGHT: Progress Publishers 1986

/9274

CSO: 1812/086

UNITED STATES AND CANADA

REAGAN CRITICS LINK IRANGATE, ARMS TALKS

PM131449 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Feb 87 Morning Edition p 5

[Melor Sturua article: "'Irangate' and Reykjavik"]

[Text] Political and secular Washington is still living "Irangate." The newspapers are competing with one another in the pursuit of new details. House of Representatives and Senate committees are questioning witnesses. This is also the task of a special investigating magistrate. The CIA is sullenly parrying attacks from the public. Changed beyond recognition, the National Security Council is trying, under the experienced leadership of Frank Carlucci, to patch up the holes in the White House ship. Political intriguers in Tel Aviv are on edge and so are bankers in Geneva. The Democrats are pouring gasoline on the already smouldering "Irangate," while the Republicans are hosing it down with water cannons. Candidates for the presidency are closely studying the results of Gallup and Harris polls--some with apprehension, others with hope. Cabinet secretaries are having nightmares about dismissals, and retired generals are having nightmares about jail. And, last but not least, the "man himself"--Ronald Reagan--is trying to remain "above the squabbling," putting a brave face on a sorry business.

As you force your way through the dense thickets of "Irangate" and go over the innumerable articles and interminable speeches on the subject, your attention is inevitably drawn to a very curious fact--the word "Reykjavik" is mentioned alongside the word "Irangate." Why? How can the Washington scandal be linked with the capital of Iceland or, to be more precise, with the Soviet-American summit meeting held there?

Ostensibly, their common feature is the U.S. President, but if one is being more precise it is the problem of his competence and physical condition. In order to shed light on the heart of the matter, I shall resort to some generous quoting. This is what James Reston writes, for example, in THE NEW YORK TIMES: "This problem ("Irangate"--M.S.) did not begin with the convoluted Iranian saga nor is it likely to end there. Worrying doubts arose even earlier on account of the administration's wrong approach to the nuclear arms talks at the summit meeting in Reykjavik..." Reston goes on to write that U.S. foreign and defense policy is formulated "in accordance with the casual methods of President Reagan

himself. At his age the president is hardly likely to suddenly develop a penchant for reading political directives before he signs them." In another article, entitled "Reagan's Age and Memory," Reston goes even further. "We know a great deal about Reagan's amazing lack of preparation for the summit meeting with Mr Gorbachev in Reykjavik," Reston says and goes on to quote an anonymous doctor who is almost the same age as the president. "This doctor," we read in Reston's article, "who is 74 years old and therefore younger than the president, has written: 'At my age I can go into the next room for something and find that I have forgotten what I came for...' The lack of preparation in Reykjavik clearly was not the result of any advance calculation on the president's part. The problem in all this is that there was nothing in his head and he had to improvise as he went along."

Reston is by no means alone in putting forward this "hypothesis." Correspondent Richard Cohen claims: "It seems that the president is not exactly sure what he proposed to the Soviet Union or what the Soviet Union proposed to him." Correspondent Lou Cannon: "Some people are saying--usually in a whisper--that Reagan is on the way down. At 75 he becomes tired more quickly..." (Reagan recently had his 76th birthday--M.S.) The newspaper LE MONDE: "In a muddle once again, the head of U.S. executive power has merely confirmed the impression that now prevails in Washington. Having reached the age of 75--a venerable age for American presidents--Reagan is no longer the 'great master of communicating with the public,' but a 'major specialist in errors.' He has made a fool of himself on such a delicate issue as Iran and on such a complex issue as strategic arms." The newspaper THE WASHINGTON TIMES: "Faith in the president and in his ability to control foreign policy has been undermined." The newspaper TODAY: "Concern is growing regarding President Reagan's mental abilities.... In the opinion of his advisers, the way the 75-year-old president handled the situation with Gorbachev in Iceland was nothing short of a catastrophe.... According to U.S. State Department spokesmen, Reagan's confidential talks with Gorbachev in Iceland horrified his advisers when they discovered that he had no clear memory of what had been discussed on extremely specialized arms control issues."

I once again beg forgiveness for the excessive use of quotations. It was no arbitrary use. I have cited statements by observers and press organs--American and West European--across the spectrum: from the left wing through the liberals, followed by the moderates, and, finally, the right wing and far right. Their unanimity is interesting, is it not?

Of course, different circles in Washington and the West in general link "Irangate" and Reykjavik for various reasons, which are sometimes diametrically opposed. Some consider Reagan incompetent because he failed to seize the historic chance offered him in the Icelandic capital and take a decisive step along the road to a real--practical and radical--reduction in nuclear weapons to the point where they would be completely eliminated. Others are concerned by something completely different, that is, the fact that the meeting in Reykjavik brought the nuclear disarmament issue to an unprecedented high spot from which new horizons opened up. And so they are trying their utmost to cloud these horizons and put them back somewhere in the region of the Greek calends. "Irangate" has provided them with a convenient instrument with which to attack Reykjavik.

I cannot share the opinion of my Soviet colleagues who have constructed the following: "Irangate," they say, was inspired by ultraright-wing circles in order to undermine Reykjavik. (The same was once said of "Watergate"--it was initiated, they said, in order to bury the detente process which got under way during the Nixon presidency). The far right is not trying to drown Reagan--on the contrary, they are trying to save him and are rallying around him during his "time of trial." Take, for example, the campaign now being waged by Patrick Buchanan and other right-wing ideological leaders. They cannot sacrifice Reagan just like that, because without his personal involvement the wave of conservatism would be threatened with collapse. But it would also be wrong to stop here. The far right is simply taking Reagan to task for "Irangate," claiming that only the letter of the law was actually broken but not its spirit or its point--namely, the fight against the "communist danger" in Nicaragua and Iran. Reykjavik is another matter. Once "Irangate" was a fait accompli, certain circles oriented toward the military-industrial complex decided that every cloud has a silver lining and used as a weapon against Reykjavik the scandal surrounding the secret arms sales to Tehran and the unlawful financing of the Nicaraguan "Contras." (The same sort of thing happened, incidentally, with "Watergate.") Other factors are also involved, of course: party feuds, personal scores, the tug-of-war between legislative and executive power, the scorching breath of the forthcoming presidential elections, and so forth. But through all this turmoil of conflicting passions there lies a quite definite course which does not have purely personal or party landmarks but bears the stamp of the policy pursued by those U.S. ruling circles which, in the shape of the military-industrial complex, now dominate Washington.

In this context it is very significant and revealing to compare two articles by two former national security advisers to the president--the Republican Kissinger and the Democrat Brzezinski. In an article entitled "Escaping the Foreign Policy Quagmire," the latter claims that "Put together, Tehran and Reykjavik... create a potential threat to the legacy the president will leave behind him." As far as "Irangate" is concerned all is clear, but what about Reykjavik? Well, Brzezinski replies, Reykjavik has "turned upside down" the traditional American strategic doctrine. The Republican Kissinger is totally in solidarity with the Democrat Brzezinski. In an article entitled "Restoration After the Chaos Sown by Reagan in Reykjavik," he cautions against a "Reykjavik revolution," as it would undermine NATO strategy. "It is not surprising," Kissinger notes, "that Moscow insists that any further talks be based on Reykjavik." And if Moscow insists, this must mean that there are shady dealings going on and everyone should be on their guard.

The U.S. military elite has also used "Irangate" to attack Reykjavik. Admiral Crowe, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who as yet is showing loyalty to the president, "was furious with Poindexter and the National Security Council for their role in the discussions which led to the arms sales to Iran," according to THE WASHINGTON POST, and gave orders to his apparatus--no, not to investigate this aspect of "Irangate" but to "evaluate the military consequences of dismantling all ballistic missiles by 1996!" Outwardly this seems to be a non sequitur. But only outwardly. "Irangate" is being used as a mine to be laid under Reykjavik. General Rogers, supreme commander NATO Allied Forces Europe, is in solidarity with Admiral Crowe. "The worst thing that could happen at the meeting in Reykjavik is success," Rogers said in an interview with the Swiss journal POLITIK UND WIRTSCHAFT.

The more heated the "Irangate" issue becomes, the more persistently it is linked with Reykjavik by those forces in the United States which are opposed to curbing the arms race and opposed to disarmament. Their aim is to wreck any possible Soviet-American accords in this sphere in the foreseeable future. If we reduce the various gambits on this score to a common denominator, it will read as follows: "Irangate" has weakened the president, consequently a summit meeting from a position of strength will prove to be impracticable, all the more so in view of the fact that the president is clearly weaker physically and could fall for the gifts of the "Greeks in Soviet garb," plus the following: "Irangate" has cast a long, dark shadow on the Reagan presidency, which is drawing to a close; in order to go down in history with the scales in his favor Reagan could try to make good by concluding a far-reaching agreement with the Soviet Union, and, to this end, "bite the apple offered to Adam by Eve." (THE NEW YORK TIMES).

The gentlemen who resort to these gambits are also trying to play them on the other side's behalf, that is, for us. They claim that, in light of "Irangate," the Soviet Union has supposedly lost interest in dealing with the present Washington administration, particularly as a change of guard in the White House is imminent, which is turning its present master into a "lame duck," that is, into the reigning but not ruling head of state.

These gambits being played for both sides pose a terrible danger to the entire disarmament process. The military-industrial complex wants to play for time, extinguish the positive momentum of Reykjavik, and effect the kind of irreversible changes in U.S. strategy and arsenals that would make accord in the spirit of Reykjavik impossible. In fact the presidential elections are to be held in 1988, the new administration will begin business in 1989, and it will still need a certain amount of time to "get into the swing of things." And in 2-3 years the program to create nuclear missile strike forces--MX, "Midgetman," "Trident-2," and others--will have made considerable progress. What is more, the first outlines of the "strategic defense initiative" will have begun to take shape. So it is not without reason that Pentagon chief Weinberger is now stubbornly forcing through the plan for the phased deployment [razvertyvaniye] of SDI. The military-industrial complex is in a hurry to stake out the "star wars" projects and get them off the drawing board and into space in order to tie the hands of both present and future administrations with a policy that will be a fait accompli.

The Soviet Union is naturally following "Irangate" with interest. But we are by no means drawing the conclusions ascribed to us by some gentlemen on the Potomac. We are well aware of the worth of peace and time. We proceed from the premise that procrastination in disarmament is fraught with great danger. That is why we are engaged in seeking real solutions rather than imaginary excuses. Any unprejudiced person who has closely studied M.S. Gorbachev's recent messages to Perez de Cuellar, UN general secretary, and the leaders of the "Delhi Six" and his statements during his conversation with a delegation of the U.S. International Relations Council, cannot fail to conclude that the Soviet Union continues to attach paramount importance to peace and international security in its foreign policy and that it continues to give priority to common human values and is invariably willing to serve them.

/8309
CSO: 1807/185

WESTERN EUROPE

GOALS, PROBLEMS OF EUREKA PROJECT DISCUSSED

Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 6, 16 Feb 87 pp 18-19

[Article by Valery Slavinsky]

[Text] In April 1985, when French President Mitterrand proposed the idea of West European countries pooling their scientific and technological potential to develop new technology, he gave it the quaint title Eureka, which means "I have found it" in Greek. In July of that year an inter-government conference of seventeen West European countries officially proclaimed Eureka a joint project.*

The next two conferences [in Hanover in November 1985 and London in June 1986] agreed on the project's long-term goals and priorities and organizational structure and approved some concrete programmes.

Let us take a closer look at this scientific and technological project. What role does Eureka have to play in the countries of the region? In other words, what is Eureka supposed to find?

Eureka is an ambitious project involving joint work in many areas. Among the priority research and development areas mentioned in the project are informatics, communication systems, robotics, flexible automated production systems, laser technology, biotechnology, the utilization of marine resources, environmental protection and transport.

A series of concrete tasks are to be achieved in each area. In electronics, which forms the core of Eureka, Western Europe intends to build a super-computer with a memory of 64 million bits and a speed of 30 billion operations per second. In a related project, a fifth-generation computer with "artificial intelligence" components is to be developed.

* Eureka was founded by the twelve member states of the European Economic Community: Belgium, Britain, Greece, Denmark, Ireland, Spain, Italy, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, Portugal, France, and the F.R.G., as well as Austria, Norway, Finland, Switzerland and Sweden. It was later joined by Turkey and Iceland.

On a Voluntary Basis

A spurt in electronics would give a boost to robotics. Autonomous self-propelled multi-purpose robots for hazardous industries are to be developed. Powerful lasers for metal cutting, assembly work and thermal treatment are to be built. Details of the Eureka project are still being worked out.

To make their joint research effective, the Eureka members intend to organize regional cooperation on new principles. Most states favour participation on a voluntary basis depending on their interest in the final results.

The supreme body is the intergovernment conference on Eureka held twice a year at the level of foreign ministers, ministers in charge of scientific research and representatives of the Commission of the European Communities. The conference reviews the work done, lays down new guidelines and proposes new programmes. It elects the country to chair the next conference and supervise the whole project in the inter-conference period. The chair country also directs the work of a group of high-ranking officials of member countries, a kind of executive committee for the Eureka project. The group has under it a small secretariat whose responsibilities include creating a data bank, disseminating information among the partner countries and consultation services to private firms and research organizations.

"The bandwagon is rolling, the momentum is increasing," said British Secretary of State for Trade and Industry Paul Channon, who chaired the London conference. The metaphor is something of an overstatement. The "bandwagon" is there and new elements are being added to it. But will it in fact be able to start rolling, what will it carry and where will it head? These questions have yet to be answered. But time is pressing as Western Europe is falling behind its main rivals, the U.S. and Japan.

Dispersed Resources

All in all, more than a million people are engaged in research and development in West European countries which spend about 20 percent of all R&D money in the world in civilian research. Western Europe spends about as much as the U.S. and twice as much as Japan. Yet West European firms still lag behind their American and Japanese rivals in several new areas.

The main reason for this lag is that the West European scientific effort and market are divided into more than 20 national components. Other causes to be mentioned are low efficiency of R&D (Japan, which spends half as much, takes out four times more patents than Western Europe), the gap between fundamental and applied research, and a slow introduction of its results in production. An integrated scientific and technological policy is designed to cope with all these problems: it would help concentrate personnel and resources for key R&D efforts, avoid duplication and quickly implement high-priority programmes. Most importantly, it will give a filip to regional cooperation in those high technology areas where Western Europe lags behind the U.S. and Japan.

The threat of "technological colonization" of the Old World further increased with the U.S. "star wars" programme, which is expected to harness West European scientific and industrial potential to U.S. military-strategic plans. It was then that Eureka was born, a project that promised to resolve all the complex problems at one fell swoop and pave the way for a united "technological Europe."

In the nearly two years since the project was launched the groundwork for it has been laid. But it is too early yet to speak of success.

Growing Pains

Eureka is now in a transitional period characterized by instability, internal struggles, revision of priorities and conflict between a desire for independence and lack of adequate resources. In short, there are problems galore.

The most acute problem is to keep the project going. Up to now the governments have been its chief motive force. Joint documents, however, assign the key role to private firms. How to stimulate them to extend their regional, scientific and technological cooperation? Propaganda appeals to "European patriotism" are no answer. Private business thinks in terms of profits and it must know who is going to pay.

Meanwhile, the ministers of the Eureka countries have agreed that the programmes will be privately financed with state budgets pitching in "in case of need." They explained that Eureka should be oriented to the production of competitive goods which the firms themselves are interested in producing. Hence private business must foot most of the bill.

There is also the problem of marketing. Industrialists welcome the idea of adjusting West European norms and standards, but they doubt whether the 19 Eureka countries will be able to carry out these plans quickly. It took years to accomplish this even within the narrower framework of the EEC. The ministers have decided that the goods produced under the approved programme will bear the Eureka trademark. But they have made the reservation that the trademark is just a "moral incentive" that does not guarantee preferential marketing terms.

Participants in the project are wondering if Eureka has not been designed to suit the interests of the leading European countries and major firms and whether the creation of regional scientific industrial unions would not further monopolize the West European market to the detriment of "junior partners."

This is by no means a complete list of the moot questions that continue to multiply as the project is rounded out and approaches the practical stage. But these difficulties are unlikely to stop Eureka. The West European leaders have staked on it heavily already. It will continue in one form or another. The question is, which one?

**TOTAL R&D SPENDING
(as per cent of GDP)**

	1981	1985
F.R.G.	2.48	2.58 *
Britain	2.42	2.27 *
France	2.01	2.27
Italy	1.01	1.19 **
Netherlands	1.88	2.00 **
Sweden	2.22	2.47 *
Austria	1.17	1.27
U.S.	2.51	2.80
Japan	2.37	2.61 *

* 1983

** 1984

/9317
CSO: 1812/76

WESTERN EUROPE

CP OF SPAIN MEETS WITH CPSU IN MOSCOW

Moscow APN DAILY REVIEW In English 24 Feb 87 pp 1-4

[Unattributed article: "Soviet and Spanish Communists Meet"]

[Text] On February 23, 1987, delegations of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of Spain met at the CPSU Central Committee.

The Soviet side was led by Anatoly Dobrynin, Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Vadim Zagladin, member of the CPSU Central Committee and first deputy head of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee.

The Communist Party of Spain had Sanchez Montero, member of the Executive Committee of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Spain and Secretary of the Central Committee of the Party for International Relations (head of the delegation); Francisco Palero, member of the Executive Committee of the Central Committee of the Party and Secretary of the Central Committee of the Party for Organization; Felipe Alcaraz, member of the Executive Committee of the Central Committee of the Party and General Secretary of the Communist Party of Andalusia; and F. Rodriguez, member of the Central Committee of the Party, Secretary of the Central Committee of the United Socialist Party of Catalonia for Organization.

During the conversation the representatives of the CPSU and the Communist Party of Spain exchanged views in detail on the major present-day international issues, and specifically ways of putting an end to the arms race and consolidating security in Europe and other regions of the world.

It was pointed out that the program for complete elimination of nuclear and other mass destruction weapons by the end of the current century put forward by Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on January 15, 1986 and further developed in the Soviet proposals put forward in Reykjavik presented a real opportunity of a dramatic turn for the better in international relations and ridding humanity of the menace of universal nuclear catastrophe.

Both parties believe that in these conditions favourable prospects emerge for more active and vigorous actions by broad political and public forces to prevent a nuclear catastrophe, scrap nuclear weapons and disband simultaneously the existing military blocs.

Spanish comrades pointed to the tremendous success of the Moscow Forum for a Nuclear-Free World, for Survival of Humanity and the Importance of the speech delivered at it by Mikhail Gorbachev, as well as of the new ideas put forward by him, including the proposal to fully dismantle foreign military bases on the territory of other countries.

Both parties went on record in favour of turning the Mediterranean Sea into a zone of peace and international cooperation, into a nuclear-free and demilitarized bulwark of peace.

Identity of views and mutual understanding between the CPSU and the Communist Party of Spain were reiterated on all matters discussed.

The CPSU delegation told the representatives of the Communist Party of Spain about the consistent work for the policy outlined by the 27th CPSU Congress to recharge Soviet society.

The CPSU delegation emphasized the significance of the January 1987 Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee which had reaffirmed and deepened the strategic course of the congress, had enriched the theoretical notion of socialism, had put forward a program for further all-round democratization of Soviet society and had shown the importance of the broad public being involved in the reorganization and indeed all Soviet people as they are the main guarantee that the changes started in this country will go through.

The delegation of the Communist Party of Spain positively assessed the revolutionary transformations now under way in the Soviet Union. The Communist Party of Spain believes that the success of the reorganization in the Soviet Union will promote the struggle for the ideas of socialism throughout the world and make a favourable impact on the communist movement.

The Spanish comrades told the CPSU delegation about the struggle waged by their party together with their allies from the United Left Coalition for radical democratic transformations in their country and about the efforts of the party leadership to restore the unity among all Spanish Communists within the Communist Party of Spain.

The CPSU delegation expressed the solidarity of Soviet Communists with the Communist Party of Spain and wished all the Spanish Communists success in their struggle for the noble ideals of socialism. It pointed out the glorious militant traditions of Spanish Communists made immortal by the names of Jose Diaz and Dolores Ibarruri. In the opinion of the CPSU, unity of communists in each country on a basis acceptable for all is an important condition for their activities.

The CPSU reiterated its will to promote in every way possible growth of the contribution made by Communists to the movement for peace and social progress, as well as its readiness to develop relations with all the fraternal parties on the basis of the principles formulated by the 27th CPSU Congress.

The representatives of the Soviet and Spanish Communists emphasized a common aspiration to promote the relations of mutually advantageous cooperation between the Soviet Union and Spain, and friendly relations between the peoples of the two countries.

The CPSU and the Communist Party of Spain noted with satisfaction that today some problems accumulated in the past have been overcome and expressed a common wish to see fraternal relations between the CPSU and the Communist Party of Spain develop and expand.

The meeting was friendly.

(PRAVDA, February 24. In full.)

/9317
CSO: 1812/087

WESTERN EUROPE

BRIEFS

WESTERN CATERING FIRMS CONTRACT—Moscow January 16 TASS—"Quick service snack bars equipped by foreign firms will open in Moscow in 1987," the newspaper SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA wrote. Five such eating places will be set up under contracts with the Italian firm Ital Trade, Austrian Austra and Swedish Electrolux. They will be roofed pavilions (40 by 25 metres each) with three or four automatic meal serving conveyor lines catering for 500 people an hour. Food will be supplied to the eating places ready-made and will only have to be warmed up. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1918 GMT 16 Jan 87 LD] /8309

CSO: 1812/73

CZECH APPROACH TO UNPROFITABLE ENTERPRISES DISCUSSED

Moscow NEW TIMES in Russian No 5, 9 Feb 87 pp 14-15

[Reader's letter answered by Miklos Ovari, Politbureau member and secretary of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party]

[Text] [Letter] I hear that industrial enterprises in Hungary are being put on a self-financing basis, and that workers' wages will depend still more on the volume of production and sales. A capitalist enterprise goes bankrupt if there is no demand for its products. The same fate would seem to await Hungarian enterprises in similar cases. What happens to the advantages of socialism?

Michael Neubert
Frankfort on the Main, FRG

Yes, we do intend to make all our enterprises pay their way. But how determined are we to carry this through? Let me be frank: the intention is there, but it is not so easy to put it into practice. You are right in saying that the economic, political and social interests of the working people are involved, and that they must be taken into account. In essence, you want to know what we are going to do with money-losing enterprises. The capitalist economy offers a simple solution: a loss-making enterprise is doomed to bankruptcy. Things are not so simple in our country because our economy has various options. The option you mention, i.e., shutting down an inefficient enterprise, is the last resort. Even if we do take such a decision, we will do so reluctantly and only after having tried every other approach.

Let me elaborate.

First of all, we will try to make the enterprise efficient. This could be done by changing the type of product to suit

the market. In other words, the enterprise and the work force will continue to exist. But instead of the former, loss-making products it will manufacture products necessary to the economy which will bring greater profits. Such a change is possible in a socialist economy through credits, subsidies and preferential treatment.

Before declaring an enterprise bankrupt, the State Bank will ask it to submit its programme of improvements, and will suggest what type of product to manufacture or how to establish co-operation with other enterprises. If liquidation still proves to be necessary, it will be carried out stage by stage over several years, which gives the enterprise a chance to pull out of the crisis. Our state is interested in the viability of enterprises and their work collectives, and is ready to come to their rescue in moments of difficulty.

Another option is replacing the managers. In our experience, enterprises

operating in similar conditions have performed differently because they were run by different people. Workers will be allowed to reelect their managers if they think it necessary.

Some products are necessary even if they are produced without profit. Weapons for defence is one instance, or products designed for the future: research equipment, generators for power stations under construction, and so on. Some economists believe that no exception should be made for such enterprises: if products are manufactured at a loss, the enterprise is a burden to the state. Bankruptcy? Yes, bankruptcy, even though it is a scandalous phenomenon in socialist conditions. "We can survive a scandal," they say, "but we shall maintain to the principle of profitability in a free market."

But it should not be forgotten that a socialist economy is not a "free-for-all"

market, but a market existing within a planned economy, which has its tactical and strategic goals. Take, for example, the Hungarian steel industry. Part of it is operating at a loss. But the rest of our industry cannot develop without metallurgy. We cannot shut down all our unprofitable metallurgical plants and buy all the millions of tons of metal we need from, say, the Soviet Union. If we adopted this approach, we would have to close down other unprofitable industries, for example, coal industry. Where would we get our coal then? From the Poles? We cannot expect the Soviet Union or Poland to expand their exports with only Hungary's interests in mind.

In these and similar cases enterprises and sectors of industry, will continue to operate even if they are unprofitable. Of course, we shall try to proceed in such a way as to minimize losses and try to improve the economic situation of the enterprise by tapping all its internal resources.

You are aware that any state--whether capitalist or socialist--faces unproductive expenditure and subsidizes not only unprofitable enterprises, but entire industries geared to strategic economic goals. In a socialist society, the scale of such subsidizing is much greater and its ultimate goals are different. If the United States is increasing its outlay to develop ever new weapons, we would like to spend public resources to meet the people's needs in housing, medical services, and other social benefits. The underlying principle of socialism is meeting public and individual needs. This is the top priority task of our economy.

Distribution of labour resources as part of the international division of labour within the socialist community is of paramount importance. Many socialist countries are already practising this with the sole purpose of

meeting the interests of their citizens more fully. The beneficiaries of this are both the state, because with us it is the state of the whole people, and the citizens, because their interests are now protected and guaranteed by the state.

No, we cannot agree that any unprofitable enterprise must be closed and liquidated. Such a step would reduce our economy to a state where it would incur debts on a greater scale than before. Even so, some enterprises in Hungary will have to be closed. This will raise a new problem: what to do with the manpower released and will it not give rise to unemployment? Such fears have been expressed. In my view there is no need to fear unemployment in a socialist system where manpower resources are redistributed under a state plan. There are a lot of vacancies in the national economy. In Hungary, for instance, we are short of workers in the service sphere. It is hard to find a person who would agree to do manual labour on a railway even for good pay. I once attended a congress of the Hungarian railwaymen's union at which it was stated that it is impossible to hire a track worker for 7,000-8,000 forints, which is much more than the average national wage. And yet for this job no retraining is necessary.

If we manage to regroup our labour resources on a national and interstate basis, and restructure industry on a similarly wide scale, the problem in the long run is not unemployment (there is no such threat in socialist countries), but for every socialist country to get its people to work where they are needed. And believe me, there are a lot of jobs.

So, I repeat, there are plans to put Hungarian industry on a self-financing basis. We are coming to grips with this task. But we can hardly say we have solved it. Doing so will take years.

JAPAN'S MILITARY BUDGET DECISION VIEWED

Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 16, 16 Feb 87 pp 6-7

[Article by Leonid Mlechin]

[Text]

JAPAN'S DECISION TO LIFT THE BUDGETARY CEILING ON MILITARY SPENDING HAS FAILED TO ATTRACT WIDESPREAD COMMENT IN THE PRESS OF MOST COUNTRIES.

Tokyo's move is fraught with more serious consequences for the region than is now believed.

The Nakasone government has done its utmost to prevent its decision attracting much attention. The political row in Washington and reports on the Prime Minister's visit to Europe and the Foreign Minister's Pacific trip eclipsed all other news. Moreover, Japan's military spending will exceed the previous limit by only 0.004 per cent in the new fiscal year. So it was not this seemingly token figure but the more substantial and very real sums the government's planned tax reform may cost millions of Japanese that compelled the opposition parties to boycott the parliament's session.

The adoption by Tokyo of this long-term scheme has certainly not passed unnoticed by the military in all the neighbouring states, who now have to calculate the balance of strategic forces in the region with this new component taken into consideration. This is no simple equation—the new component is not a constant but a variable tending to increase. This makes the balance unstable, as noted not only by Moscow and Peking, but by all those who follow the dynamics of Japan's military policy.

The Pentagon welcomed the move, but its enthusiasm was somewhat dampened by the worried voice of Henry Kissinger, one-time U.S. Secretary of State. His long article on the rearmament of Japan was carried by the newspaper Newsday and, a day later, reprinted by the Washington Post (with minor changes). Kissinger warns that, having removed the budgetary barrier, Japan will inevitably emerge as a major

military power. "...All this imposes on the United States the need to undertake a long overdue reassessment of its security interests in Asia," he writes.

What made Kissinger sound the alarm? American politicians and the military usually proceed from the premise that the strengthening of the Self-Defence Forces is in U.S. interests and urge their Japanese partners to arm. Tokyo agrees with them, while scaring its citizens by the "threat from the north." Kissinger rejects this premise outright. Modest in numerical strength as they are, the Self-Defence Forces are perfectly equal to deterring a potential aggressor. With its armed forces Japan simply wishes to play the role of a superpower, albeit on a regional scale. "Enthusiasm for quick fixes," the former Secretary of State points out, "is a dangerous guide for foreign policy. Major rearmament would set in motion developments and temptations not deducible from contemporary pronouncements.... Any in-

crease in strength by one country produces almost automatic adjustments by all other nations in a position to see to their own security."

Tokyo's military moves will certainly cause the regional arms race, already moving rapidly enough, to spiral. China will follow Japanese actions closely. The strengthening of the Japanese armed forces will hardly leave Southeast Asia cold. The "compensatory" military measures taken by any of these states will, in turn, stir their neighbours to action; all this will alert a very wide range of states from Australia to North Korea, from India and Mongolia to the Philippines and Indonesia. Asia is full of old sores which, like unhealed wounds, may start bleeding at any moment.

What really worries Kissinger is not the likelihood of new tragedies, but the very real prospect of the U.S. losing its influence in the region. Indeed, he reproaches his government with having no Asian policy.

Moscow's active diplomacy in the East has caught both Washington and Tokyo unawares and compelled them to revise their tactics. The United States hastened to

offer loans to small South Pacific states which, in their pursuit of independence, are establishing contacts with the Soviet Union—common international practice. For its part, Japan has come up with a programme, the first of its kind in postwar history, for economic assistance to the Pacific countries.

The constructive policy pursued by the socialist countries in Asia has added to their prestige and to the weight they carry in regional and world affairs. The establishment of diplomatic relations between the Mongolian People's Republic and the United States is evidence of this, the Japanese newspaper *Asahi* comments.

While in Moscow, Mongolian Foreign Minister Mengalin Duguersuren discussed with Soviet leaders the new steps taken by the two countries to promote universal security in Asia. This region is now in special need of what it has lacked so far—a dynamic and comprehensive diplomacy. This, however, is not to be "power diplomacy" as exemplified by Tokyo's shortsighted decision to go ahead with the unbridled buildup of its Self-Defence Forces.

/9317
CSO: 1812/78

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

AFRICA'S PROBLEMS, OAU'S ROLE IN THEIR SOLUTION ASSESSED

Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS in English No 11, Nov 86 pp 120-125

[Article by Nikolai Svetlanov]

[Text]

It will not be an overstatement to say that today's independent Africa has every right to open its new calendar with the founding of the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) in 1963. And it is not by chance that with due regard to this historical event, the OAU's founding date—May 25—is yearly celebrated all over the world as Africa Liberation Day. Today 50 sovereign African states are members of this regional intergovernmental organisation, and representatives of national liberation movements in South Africa and Namibia take part in its work as observers.

The founding of the OAU scored a great victory for Africa's anti-colonial forces. It showed the objective need for unity on the part of all the newly free countries along anti-imperialist lines, to achieve full decolonisation, social and economic progress and the cultural revival of Africa.

Looking back on the road covered by the OAU since its inception nearly a quarter of a century ago it should be said that it was not that easy. Suffice it to recall the hard times in the early 1980s when the organisation had been almost on the verge of dissolving under pressure from neo-colonialist, pro-imperialist forces, and when following the failure of one of its Assembly sessions there had even been prophesies that the organisation had outlived itself and was on the verge of demise.

That is why in the atmosphere of the politically acute and contradictory struggle underway in the African countries each new forum of the African leaders draws particular interest especially in terms of the extent to which the young sovereign states support the anticolonial, anti-imperialist course, their ability to stand up in the unequal struggle against the organised forces of imperialism and neo-colonialism, the consistency of their endeavour to preserve unity of action aimed at the final eradication of the vestiges of colonialism on the political map of present-day Africa.

The 44th Ordinary Session of the Council of Ministers of the OAU (July 21-25) and the 22nd Session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the OAU (July 28-30) were held in Addis Ababa, the capital of Ethiopia and the seat of OAU headquarters.

From the outset the tone of the discussions was set by the opening statements of the head of the Ethiopian state Mengistu Haile Mariam where special accent was placed on the key African problem--eliminating the "bastion of colonialism, racism and apartheid" in the south of Africa. The Ethiopian leader called the delegates' attention to the tragic situation in South Africa, the result of the intensified repressions of Pretoria's racist regime. He called upon representatives of the African states to work out concrete proposals and recommendations for the practical implementation of the well-known resolutions passed by the UN, the OAU and other international bodies denouncing colonialism and proclaiming the independence of the South African peoples.

It was not by chance, therefore, that the most heated debates both at the Session of the Council of Ministers and at the meetings of the Assembly sessions, were raised by the discussion of the situation in the south of Africa and by the question of sanctions against South Africa. In submitting his report on the problems of decolonisation to the plenary meeting, A. Dede, OAU Deputy Secretary-General for Political Affairs, said that the struggle to eliminate the apartheid regime in South Africa had entered a decisive stage.

Expressing discontent with the results of the Paris Conference held in June on sanctions against the Republic of South Africa the speaker and the participants in the plenary meeting underlined that discussion of Pretoria's behaviour was not enough and that it was high time to take concrete measures and introduce obligatory economic sanctions first of all. The day after the US President made in Washington his policy-making address on US policy in Southern Africa (July 22) the Session of the OAU Council of Ministers, on the initiative of Nigerian Foreign Minister Bolaji Akinyemi, passed a resolution stating that "much publicised July 22 speech of President Reagan of the United States has been rejected by the people of South Africa and all progressive mankind". The White House's stand which boiled down to the defence of the Pretoria regime was qualified as justification of the inhuman apartheid system and overt support for racism.

The delegates taking part in the session of the OAU Council of Ministers passed a resolution condemning the USA and Britain's refusal to impose sanctions against the South African regime and urging the US Congress to impose obligatory and comprehensive sanctions on the part of the USA. An identical appeal was addressed to the world community and especially to the public in those Western countries whose governments continue to cooperate with South Africa.

The USA, Britain, West Germany, as well as France and Israel, are also resolutely condemned for their cooperation with Pretoria in the economic and nuclear spheres in the general resolution on the situation in the south of Africa. It strongly denounced Thatcher's government for its deliberate campaign against the sanctions. The ministers called upon the African, non-aligned and other countries to increase pressure on the British government by taking concrete steps of their own choice from sports boycotts, economic sanctions, to breaking off diplomatic relations.

A special resolution adopted on the initiative of Nigeria calls upon the OAU member states to fight for the full isolation of South Africa on the continent. In keeping with this resolution those states that have not yet accepted this line should refrain from providing transit facilities for its vessels and aircraft.

The Western states' reaction to this resolution was highly symptomatic. The West German envoy to Ethiopia, for instance, even made an unofficial protest pointing to the African states' "lack of understanding" for

the West German stand on the south of Africa. Alleging that West Germany's NATO membership and solidarity with other member states made it difficult to show its respect for the African countries, he presented his country as a close and true ally of these countries in their just anti-racist struggle, including its approach to the issue of sanctions against South Africa.

The resolute stand taken by the OAU on the question of sanctions won the approval of the representatives of the African National Congress (ANC) that were present at the session. According to Johnson Makatini, Director of the ANC International Relations Department, the introduction of sanctions was the last opportunity to normalise the situation in South Africa by peaceful means; he said that otherwise the conflict was liable to turn into a bloodbath of the kind the world had not known since the Second World War.

The forum of African leaders decided to establish a special standing committee of heads of states on the question of southern Africa comprising the heads of the "frontline" states, leaders of the national liberation movements and representatives of five OAU geographical zones (Nigeria, Algeria, Ethiopia, Cape Verde, Congo). Its task would be to work out new initiatives for the earliest possible elimination of the apartheid regime in South Africa and the granting of independence to Namibia.

As noted in the report of OAU Secretary-General Ide Oumarou, the decolonisation of Namibia in the period under review had not made any progress. The International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia held this July in Vienna did no more than establish the fact that South Africa was impeding the implementation of the respective UN resolution. It was the duty of all African states, said Ide Oumarou, to shift from taking a wait-and-see stand and verbal denunciations to adopting a specific programme of aid to SWAPO, which has repeatedly maintained that independence for Namibia can be achieved only by armed struggle.

In condemning Western policy in South Africa the heads of state adopted a declaration of protest against the interference of the US Administration in Angola's domestic affairs. Washington's decision to supply the UNITA gangs with Stinger anti-aircraft missiles was assessed in the document as an undeclared war against Angola that challenged all OAU member states. The heads of state declared that US support for the anti-Angola groupings was a grave violation of the 1970 UN Declaration on non-interference and the observance of normal relations between states, as flouting the principles of the UN Charter. The open and deliberate interference of the US Administration into Angola's internal affairs is a hostile act against the OAU. As the document maintains the People's Republic of Angola (PRA) had the legitimate right to undertake any measures it seemed fit to defend its sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity.

The declaration rejects the South African and US attempts to link Namibia's independence with the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola, in as much as the sovereign right to determine the date of their withdrawal lies only with the government of the PRA. The document also urges the US Congress to take steps to immediately curb the Washington Administration's gross interference in Angola's internal affairs.

The 22nd Ordinary Session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the OAU discussed the situation in Chad and the territorial conflict between Chad and Libya. The Assembly instructed the new OAU Chairman, Denis Sassou Nguesso, to persist in cooperation with President

Albert-Bernard (Omar) Bongo of Gabon in applying efforts to achieve national reconciliation in Chad under the OAU aegis. Bongo was entrusted with the task of taking measures to revive the work of the special OAU mediatory committee for achieving a Chad-Lybia settlement. The Assembly approved (with a reservation from Somalia) the resolution on the settling of frontier conflicts through negotiations. A separate resolution was passed on the founding of the OAU "council of wisemen" for reconciling beligerent parties in Africa. It is indicative that the need to settle all disputes between African neighbour countries exclusively by peaceful means had been expressed 20 years before in an identical resolution adopted when the OAU was making its first steps.

By tradition the participants also discussed the Middle East and Palestinian issues. This time the discussion was confined to the formerly approved provisions, adding nothing new to the existing resolutions.

At the session serious attention was paid to the question of the so-called pan-African armed forces, discussed within the framework of the reports made at the 46th Session of the Coordinating Committee for the Liberation Movements of Africa (Arusha, July 14-22) and the 9th Session of the OAU Defence Commission (Harare, May 27-30). An attempt was made to give new impetus to the popular idea of setting up a pan-African supreme military command and forces for collective African security, advanced by Ghana's President Kwame Nkrumah at the inception of the OAU.

The Secretariat put forward for discussion proposals on establishing under the OAU a special coordinating defence body, elaborating its status, strengthening inter-African military cooperation and promoting the activity of the OAU Defence Commission. All these questions were prompted to a great extent by South Africa's aggressive acts against Angola, Zambia, Botswana and Zimbabwe early in 1986 and the US aggression against Libya.

The discussion brought out the different approaches to the problem of African collective security. At a special press conference Ethiopia's Foreign Minister Goshu Wolde explained his country's stand on the problem, saying that it approved on the whole the idea of establishing inter-African defence forces and gave its support to the respective bodies for their coordination and command. He said that in conditions when the racist South African regime continued to occupy Namibia and launched bandit attacks on the "front-line" and neighbouring states an African defence force was becoming particularly necessary. He noted, however, that while the Ethiopian government approved in principle the validity of this issue concerning the idea of setting up these forces, along with the delegates of Zimbabwe, Egypt, Bourkina Fasso and the Republic of Guinea, it considered its realisation as untimely. It pointed in this connection to the present lack of political will among the Africans and the high cost of maintaining such a collective army which is often beyond the means of many African countries. He also noted that the need to draw on foreign monetary sources to cover its expenses, to apply inevitably to Europe or the USA for these means, would make this army African in name only.

By way of a constructive approach to this problem Ethiopia proposed extending at this stage support for the armed struggle waged by the national liberation movements in the south of the continent and building up bilateral and subregional cooperation between African states in matters of defence. Armed forces created on the basis of such cooperation could become the forerunner of a future collective African army. Ethiopia's Foreign Minister reminded the Assembly of Ethiopia's decision to train 10,000 fighters for the national liberation movements in the south of Africa.

Economic problems figured prominently at the 22nd Session of the OAU's Assembly. This could only have been expected, for this was the first African forum held since the special May 1986 UN General Assembly Session dedicated to the critical economic situation in Africa. And it was precisely in the framework of the results obtained at the special session in New York that the African leaders tried to outline the ways of tackling Africa's socio-economic hardships.

In his opening speech Adebayo Adedeji (Nigeria), Executive Secretary of the UN Economic Commission for Africa (ECA), urged African countries "to stop endless debates" on whether the New York session had scored success or brought failure to Africa. Instead, he said, it was necessary to make the fullest use of the commitments undertaken by the international community in the UN Programme of Action for African Economic Recovery and Development, 1986-1990, a document which he was convinced could serve as the basis for further negotiations between separate African countries and the "community of donor-states."

Despite the general assessment that the UN special session had proved useful for Africa, several heads of delegations were disappointed that it had not been able to transform the Priority Programme for Economic Recovery of Africa into concrete commitments of the world community with regard to individual African countries as had been proposed by the OAU and the ECA during the session's preparatory stage, in New York.

This was perhaps why during the discussion of economic problems, for the first time in the last few years, mention was made of the fact that the West was using its economic aid to Africa as a means of bringing political pressure to bear on these countries and foisting capitalist models of development on the continent. Underlining the disinterested aid of the USSR, Madagascar's President Didier Ratsiraka noted that the Soviet Union helped his country to fulfil its agricultural programme.

The resolution of the Assembly on the results of the UN special session in New York notes that the "international community has demonstrated its readiness to assist Africa's efforts to achieve economic recovery and development". The OAU Secretary-General has been charged with the task of holding consultations with the respective UN specialised agencies and intergovernmental organisations to work out practical conditions for implementing the UN Programme of Action. The OAU member states, regional and subregional organisations are recommended to create mechanisms for executing the Priority Programme of Economic Recovery of Africa and the aforesaid UN programme. A report on the results of their implementation will be delivered at the 46th Session of the OAU Council of Ministers in 1987.

African leaders have discussed the question of setting up an African economic community. They were satisfied with the progress made in this direction and assigned the OAU permanent committee on the supervision and the implementation of the economic resolutions to study the technical and political conditions that would facilitate the founding of such a community. It was noted, however, that its founding would be untimely at this stage owing to the African countries' insufficient economic integration. By way of an alternative the OAU Assembly recommended the further development and strengthening of subregional African institutions and associations.

At the same time the session urged that work be continued to develop recommendations for promoting the idea of the future African economic community and ruled that a report on this subject be prepared for the next OAU Assembly session to be held in 1987.

The sessions' economic committee discussed the question of establishing an African monetary fund. It was decided that this question be han-

ded over to the OAU standing committee for the supervision and the implementation of economic resolutions in order to settle the disputes that could spring up in the process of mapping out the fund's charter. The document will then be submitted for a final decision to the financial ministers of African countries.

The session passed a special resolution on the African countries' foreign debt. According to the UN ECA their debt has reached \$180,000 million. It should be stressed that this problem was of grave concern to OAU ministers and heads of state during the discussion of economic questions. Speaking of the need to hold as soon as possible an international conference on Africa's foreign debt Kenya's Vice-President Mwai Kibaki emphasised that African leaders had to define precisely when and who will organise such a conference.

The 44th Session of the OAU Council of Ministers once again emphasised the need for more effective work of the OAU Secretariat in light of the structural and financial reforms proposed by Ide Oumarou last year. It was expected that their implementation would enable the organisation to reach greater success in solving the new political and socio-economic problems. As noted in the report of the OAU Secretary-General major attention should be given to the all-round strengthening of this inter-African organisation to increase its effectiveness as a "mobilising force".

Delegates stressed in their speeches that as the OAU Secretary General Ide Oumarou strived to act strictly in the accordance with the mandate to carry out the reforms which had been granted to him by the previous session of the Council of Ministers. For instance, by that time three OAU subregional departments in Accra, Banji and Kampala had been closed and the Secretariat personnel had been reduced by 126 employees. The session adopted a resolution which positively assessed Ide Oumarou's activities and reaffirmed his mandate for carrying out other measures aimed to improve the structure of the Organisation and enliven its activities.

The Assembly of the Heads of State and Government also examined a number of other important organisational political issues and among them the decision to review in the near future the OAU Charter and to expand therefore the special Charter review committee from 18 to 28 members; to provide support to M'Bow, UNESCO General Director, in re-electing him for another term of office; to establish a special section within the OAU Secretariat on the problems of enlivening African women's involvement in the process of socio-economic development; the approval of the OAU hymn, and other matters.

Denis Sassou-Nguesso was unanimously elected OAU Chairman. His concluding statement underlined the need to raise the OAU's dynamic force and role as well as the significance of the African factor in tackling present-day international issues, including the fight for peace and disarmament. In his statement a noteworthy place was given to "renovating the ideas of pan-Africanism", mobilising Africa's unity by raising inter-African scientific, cultural and sports cooperation, and employing the intellectual potential of the younger generation of Africans.

The ordinary sessions of the OAU Council of Ministers and the OAU Assembly of Heads of State and Government showed that the organisation had made a significant step forward towards achieving a further stabilisation of African unity.

They confirmed the endeavour of the sovereign African states to tackle jointly the continent's more acute political and socio-economic problems, especially those concerning the final elimination of the vestiges of colonialism, racism and apartheid, and the normalisation of the complex economic situation. They have clearly shown the OAU's anticolonial and anti-imperialist thrust in tackling Africa's political problems.

COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Znaniye", 1986
English Translation Copyright Progress
Publishers 1986

/9317
CSO: 1812/90

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

FORMATION OF INTERNATIONAL 'AFRICA' MOVEMENT REPORTED

Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 5, 9 Feb 87 p 8

[Article by Leonid Zhegalov]

[Text]

THE REASON FOR THE QUOTATION MARKS AND THE CAPITALS IN THE TITLE, "AFRICA,"

is that the word AFRICA is an acronym for a new international movement: Action for Resisting Invasion, Colonialism and Apartheid. Its creation was announced in January at the Delhi conference of the heads of state and government of nine non-aligned countries—Algeria, Argentina, Zambia, Zimbabwe, India, Congo, Nigeria, Peru and Yugoslavia. They form the coordinating committee which the 8th non-aligned summit in Harare last September made responsible for organizing assistance to countries affected by the aggressive policies of the South African racist authorities. In carrying out this mandate, the participants in the Delhi meeting set up a special AFRICA-Fund in support of the new movement, chaired by India. Its initial capital is \$70 million.

The money will be used to finance a massive programme to boost the economies of the frontline states in south-

ern Africa, which have to repel acts of aggression by the Pretoria racist regime. The fund will help them to implement economic sanctions against the apartheid regime and cope with the consequences of retaliatory measures by South African racists. It will also give material support to the popular liberation movements in South Africa and Namibia.

What will the concrete procedure be for using this fund? A strategic buffer stock of food (150,000 tons) will be set up to make the frontline states independent of food imports from South Africa. The fund will finance their purchases of materials and equipment for their vital industries and transport, which are targets of sabotage by the racists and their henchmen. It will foot much of the bill for supplying fuel to these countries.

On the whole, the measures planned will enable the independent countries in southern Africa gradually to slough off the historically and geographically conditioned dependence of their economies

on that of South Africa.

The results of the Delhi meeting accurately reflect the new trend within the non-aligned movement—the promotion of a South-South dialogue, i.e., cooperation and mutual assistance between the developing countries themselves. This process has a marked anti-imperialist thrust: in a special appeal to the international community, the Delhi meeting condemned Pretoria's Western benefactors, particularly the United States, who are aiding and abetting the racists under cover of talk about "constructive engagement," while in fact seeking to maintain their political and strategic hold on southern Africa.

The leaders of the nine non-aligned countries who met in the Indian capital appealed to the states of the world as well as to international and public organizations to make donations to the AFRICA-Fund, which will become a new instrument in the peoples' struggle against racism, that ugly offshoot of imperialism.

/9317
CSO: 1812/65

CEMA, MOZAMBIQUE SIGN COOPERATION AGREEMENT

Moscow CMEA. ECONOMIC COOPERATION in English No 3, 86 pp 115-116

[Text]

The Council for Mutual Economic Assistance and the People's Republic of Mozambique

setting out from the fact that the CMEA member countries attach special importance to trade with developing countries and to the improvement of economic, scientific and technological cooperation in order to promote the growth and consolidation of their economies.

establishing with satisfaction, the state of development of bilateral economic relations between the CMEA member countries and the People's Republic of Mozambique.

bearing in mind the mutual efforts of the CMEA member countries and the People's Republic of Mozambique to improve multilateral economic, scientific and technological cooperation on the basis of mutual respect for sovereignty, independence and national interests, non-interference in internal affairs, full equality of rights and mutual benefits.

desiring to promote favourable conditions for multilateral cooperation between the CMEA member countries and the People's Republic of Mozambique.

persuaded that the progress of such cooperation, arranged with the concern for the principles of the Charter of

Economic Rights and Obligations of States, will promote the acceleration of economic, scientific and technological progress in the CMEA member countries and in the People's Republic of Mozambique, as well as the targets specified by the Charter of the United Nations.

taking into account the principles of the CMEA's Charter emphasizing the readiness of the CMEA member countries to further their economic relations with other countries.

have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

1. The purpose of the present Agreement is to establish and promote multilateral economic, scientific and technological cooperation between the CMEA member countries and the People's Republic of Mozambique.

2. In conformity with the present Agreement cooperation will be realized in different fields of the economy, agriculture, industry, the prospecting and exploitation of mineral deposits, science and technology and as agreed by the Parties, various subjects of mutual interest for the CMEA member countries and the People's Republic of Mozambique.

ARTICLE 2

1. In order to achieve the targets set in Article 1 of the present Agreement, and to organize cooperation envisaged by the present Agreement, a Mixed Commission for Cooperation between the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance and the People's Republic of Mozambique, to be referred to as Mixed Commission below, will be established.

2. The Mixed Commission consists of the representatives of the CMEA member countries and those of the People's Republic of Mozambique. It is appointed by the competent authorities of these countries.

ARTICLE 3

1. In the course of carrying out its duties the Mixed Commission may submit proposals to the CMEA member countries and to the People's Republic of Mozambique on economic, scientific and technological cooperation and may take decisions concerning organization and procedure.

2. The Mixed Commission agrees to proposals and takes decisions with the agreement of the CMEA member countries involved and of the People's Republic of Mozambique.

3. Proposals of the Mixed Commission agreed to by the CMEA member countries and the People's Republic of Mozambique will be realized through multilateral and/or bilateral agreements between states, their authorities, organizations and institutions or in some other approved way.

ARTICLE 4

The CMEA member countries and the People's Republic of Mozambique will provide the necessary assistance

for the activity of the Mixed Commission concerning every question of mutual interest, including those raised by the Mixed Commission itself, and will present to it the materials and information required to carry out its duties.

ARTICLE 5

The Mixed Commission carries out its duties in compliance with legislation related to the present Agreement.

ARTICLE 6

The Council for Mutual Economic Assistance and the People's Republic of Mozambique will take measures, as experience accumulates and multilateral cooperation between the CMEA member countries and the People's Republic of Mozambique expands and widens, to improve and develop the organization forms, means and methods of this cooperation.

ARTICLE 7

The provisions of the present Agreement shall not prejudice the rights and responsibilities of the CMEA member countries and of the People's Republic of Mozambique arising from their membership in international organizations or from agreements concluded by those countries or by the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance.

ARTICLE 8

The present Agreement will not impede any of the CMEA member countries and the People's Republic of Mozambique in maintaining direct relations and signing bilateral agreements with each other concerning the economy, agriculture, industry, prospecting for and exploitation of mineral resources, science and technology out-

side the present Agreement and it does not affect the validity of bilateral agreements in force between them.

ARTICLE 9

Questions related to the realization of the present Agreement will be arranged through negotiations between representatives of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance and those of the People's Republic of Mozambique.

ARTICLE 10

1. The present Agreement, if approved by the CMEA member countries, is subjected to ratification by the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance and the People's Republic of Mozambique. The Agreement will come into force 30 days after exchanging ratification documents.

2. Given the mutual agreement of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance and the People's Republic of Mozambique, the present Agreement, including the Statutes of the Mixed Commission, may be amended or added to in accordance with the stipulations of point 1 of the present article.

ARTICLE 11

1. The present Agreement is concluded for an unlimited period of time. However, any of the Parties can terminate it by giving at least six months' notice.

Cooperation between the CMEA member countries and the People's Republic of Mozambique on the basis of recommendations put forward by the Mixed Commission and adopted by them, will continue even after the termination of the above mentioned period of six months, unless any of the countries participating in that cooperation wishes to terminate them as a whole or limit them in part. In this case the terms and conditions of termination of limitation will be agreed between the CMEA member countries concerned and the People's Republic of Mozambique.

2. Withdrawal of one of the Parties from the present Agreement will not affect the legal force of the agreements concluded by authorities, organizations and institutions of the CMEA member countries and of the People's Republic of Mozambique in conformity with point 3 of Article 3 of the present Agreement.

Terms concerning amendments or the termination of the validity of agreements concluded in conformity with point 3 of Article 3 of the present Agreement must be specified in such agreements.

Signed on 17th May 1985 in Moscow, in two original copies, the Russian and Portuguese texts being of equal validity.

Appended signatures

COPYRIGHT: All Rights Reserved by CMEA Secretariat
/9317

CSO: 1812/61

END

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

18 May 87